Class 239.092 Book 1910-11
General Theological Seminary Library
Chelsea Square, New York

Purchased from the fund bequeathed to the Seminary by
EUGENE AUGUSTUS HOFFMAN, D. D.
DEAN 1879-1902

THE ATONEMENT AND MODERN THOUGHT

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA. 3s.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S "CITY OF GOD." A Translation, with Notes. New and Revised Edition. 1s. 6d.

THE PRESENT CONTROVERSY ON PRAYER. 2s.

SUGGESTIONS FOR BIBLE STUDY. 2s.

CHRIST AND HIS CRITICS. 2s. 6d.

THE MYSTERY OF THE CROSS. 3s. 6d.

MIDLAND SEPTS AND THE PALE. 3s. 6d.

TYPES OF CELTIC LIFE AND ART. 3s. 6d.

THE ATONEMENT AND MODERN THOUGHT

BEING THE DONNELLAN LECTURES PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN

BY

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, B.D.

FORMERLY SCHOLAR AND UNIVERSITY STUDENT OF TRINITY COLLEGE

AUTHOR OF

"CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA," "PRESENT CONTROVERSY ON PRAYER," "CHRIST AND HIS CRITICS," "MYSTERY OF THE CROSS" "SUGGESTIONS FOR BIBLE STUDY"

GEN. THEO. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

LONDON
WELLS GARDNER, DARTON & CO., LTD.
3 & 4, PATERNOSTER BUILDINGS, E.C.
AND 44, VICTORIA STREET S.W.

239.092
1910-'11

60010

UNION THEOL. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

To

MY WIFE, ANNIE ISABEL

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	SIN AND ATONEMENT	1
II.	LEADING PRINCIPLES FOR A THEORY	62
III.	THE SOURCE OF THE ATONEMENT	138
IV.	THE MEANS OF THE ATONEMENT: MEDIATION AND THE MEDIATOR	163
V.	IDENTIFICATION: THE SECRET OF THE ATONEMENT	184
VI.	RETRIBUTION	217
VII.	FORGIVENESS	240
VIII.	THE PRINCIPLE OF RECONCILIATION	255
IX.	THE RECONCILIATION OF CHRIST	268
X.	PRIESTHOOD AND SACRIFICE	283
XI.	THE LAMB OF GOD	304
XII.	ATONEMENT AND RESPONSIBILITY	320

THE ATONEMENT AND MODERN THOUGHT

CHAPTER I

SIN AND ATONEMENT

It is our conception of God that determines our conception of sin, as it is our doctrine of sin that determines our theory of redemption. Theology and modern thought are not at one in regard of sin. Indeed, there is no point, seemingly, in which modern thought and conventional theology are so opposed as in their conception of sin and the place they assign to it. The problem before us is: Can the mind of Christianity with regard to sin be expressed in terms acceptable to the intellectual and moral thought of our age, without betraying important interests on one side or burdening conscience unnecessarily on the other?

The doctrine of Atonement, however, is equally independent both of theological and modern views of the origin and propagation of sin. The moral solidarity of the race is in itself the basis of a universal Atonement; while a philosophical theory of sin has the advantage over the theological doctrine of the Fall in this, that it withholds the term "guilt" from evil for which man is not answerable, and while betraying no interests vital to

moral wellbeing, will not allow the conscience to be burdened with what is not subjectively its sin.

According to the most scientific form of Christian teaching, which accepts in a modified form the doctrine of evolution, sin is something that has arrested the development and interfered with the ascent of man. But the evolutionary view that moral evil is rather failure on man's part to rise than a fall from a state of perfection,[1] a necessary stage through which humanity must pass on its way to perfection, has weakened the sense of sin. To solve the problem of evil is, indeed, to read the enigma of life. If we regard it from the Divine standpoint, it is something that opposes the realisation of the Divine idea. If we approach it from the human point of view, it is something that causes misery, unhappiness, unrest, remorse, which stimulates to repentance and deliverance, and so contains in itself the promise and potency of victory over evil. If, however, with the exponents of the New Theology, we hold that "nothing is gained by disguising the fact that there is no remedy for a bad heart, and no substitute for a good one,"[2] then we may well despair of teaching morality to the *ignobile vulgus*, and confine our attention to "apt scholars." But even among thoughtful men, the sense of sin—which found expression in the Reformation and in the Evangelical and Oxford revivals, and without a deepening of which there can be no revival of vital religion—in the theological sense, is becoming more and more unreal ;[3] and sin, in the theo-

[1] See Sir Oliver Lodge, "Man and the Universe," p. 239. See also p. 17 : "Taught by science, we learn that there has been no fall of man ; there has been a rise."

[2] Mr. Cotter Morrison, "Service of Man."

[3] Gore, "Old Theology and the New Religion," p. 231. "It is my persuasion that there will be no revival of vital religion among us, on any large scale or with any adequate results, except through a deepening of the sense of sin ; a return to the properly Christian severity of view about the meaning of sin and its consequences."

logical sense, more and more chimerical. On the one hand, the materialistic view of life reduces man to an automaton, devoid of moral responsibility and consequently of guilt. On the other hand, the age in its best representatives has become more alive to the social and racial aspects of evil, while it is losing sight of the individual and personal; and this leads to a more general demand for a more general reformation. The growing conception of the solidarity of the race must lead to a solidary treatment of that which affects the social organism of humanity.

In striking contrast with the saying ascribed to Mr. Gladstone that "the sense of sin" was the greatest need of the age, is the utterance of a leading physicist (Sir Oliver Lodge), viz.: "As a matter of fact, the higher man of the day is not worrying about his sins at all, still less about their punishment. . . . And as for 'original' or 'birth sin,' or other notion of that kind—by which is partly meant the sin of his parents—that sits absolutely lightly on him. As a matter of fact, it is non-existent, and none but a monk could have invented it. Whatever it be, it is not a business for which we are responsible. We did not make the world; and an attempt to punish us for our animal origin and ancestry would be simply comic." [1]

But it is to be noted that the new psychology, which takes into account such contributory or such predisposing causes to crime as heredity, moral and physical environment, and ignorance, suggests a scheme of redemption by propagation of knowledge, improvement of conditions of life and social environment, and sounder economy. Theology, indeed, requires something more than the brute-inheritance [2] theory of evolution, which relieves one

[1] "Man and the Universe," p. 220.

[2] See Fiske, "Man's Destiny," p. 102. "Thus we see what human progress means. It means throwing off the brute-inheritance—gradually throwing it off through ages of struggle that are by-and-by

of responsibility, and consequently of self-condemnation for resistance to the Divine Spirit. But it is, at any rate, satisfactory to learn that the dualism of life, which was so distracting to the Apostle, might be explained on natural grounds as due to the survival of instincts which conflict with present aspirations;[1] and that the idea of evolution or of purposeful growth, through the stress and strain of the struggle of ill-equipped capacities with inadequate environments, serves to reconcile the Fatherly love of God with the present existence of imperfection, and to foster the hope of its ultimate removal in the crowning age of ages.

Although a theory of the Atonement is in no way responsible for an exhaustive or satisfactory account of sin and its origin, it must emphasise the great cleavage the failure to follow one's moral light and ideals has made in the life of man, and the sad separation that wilfulness and disobedience, when they rise into con-

---

to make struggle needless. . . . The ape and the tiger in human nature will become extinct. Theology has had much to say about original sin. This original sin is neither more nor less than the brute-inheritance which every man carries with him, and the progress of evolution is an advance towards true salvation." *Cf.* Tennyson, "In Memoriam":

"Arise and fly
The reeling Faun, the sensual feast;
Move upward, working out the beast,
And let the ape and tiger die."

[1] "To the evolutionist sin is not an innovation, but is the survival or misuse of habits and tendencies that were incidental to an earlier stage in development, whether of the individual or the race, and were not originally sinful, but were actually useful" (Canon Wilson, Church Congress, 1896). "Moral evil is rather failure on man's part to rise higher in the scale of being than a fall from a state of perfection, which was his when he started upon his history" ("Cambridge Essays," v.). "We are no longer as those who look back to a paradise in which man fell; we are rather as those who, 'rowing hard against the stream, see distant gates of Eden gleam, and do not dream it is a dream'" (Professor Thompson, "Bible of Nature," p. 226).

sciousness, are felt to make between man and GOD. And the psychological analysis of evil may help us to understand the way of its removal, and lead to the solution of the problem whether evil is to be final and universal, or whether good is to prevail.

The subject is baffling. Julius Müller, who made an exhaustive examination of the subject, declared: "Evil itself is the unfathomable secret of the world; in its inmost depths it ever remains in impenetrable darkness."[1] Henry Vandyke said: "We can give no rational account of its origin, because its origin appears irrational."[2] And Canon Aubrey Moore described it as "the one irrational, lawless, meaningless thing in the moral universe."[3] And yet some psychological analysis of sin is necessary if one would approach the subject of sin and its atonement from a moral as well as from a spiritual standpoint, and if we would reinterpret the doctrine of sin in terms that may prove acceptable to modern thought, explaining the individual sense of sin without prejudice to the universality of sin, and explaining the universality of sin without prejudice to individual responsibility.

In the first place we may lay down the general proposition that sin, when used as the correlative of guilt, is a purely subjective concept. There is no metaphysical entity corresponding to the idea of sin. Its creation is due to a false abstraction. Sin itself is an activity of the will, however expressed, against conscience or knowledge. The habit of sin is the attitude of opposition to what one believes and thinks is right.

The result of sin as separation between GOD and man —for so the religious consciousness views it—throws a light on the relation of finite and infinite, GOD and man.

[1] "Christian Doctrine of Sin," ii. 189.
[2] "Gospel for a World of Sin," p. 26.
[3] "Essays Scientific and Philosophical," pp. 64-65.

The problem of sin was accordingly a religious one rather than a philosophical for the Jew and the Christian. And, in a manner, the religious view is the key to the philosophical problem in its insistence on the freedom of will, human responsibility, and the universality of sin. The Hebrews recognised in sin a missing of the mark,[1] perversity,[2] a voluntary principle of rebelliousness,[3] a trespass,[4] presumption,[5] negligence and ignorance,[6] as well as ceremonial and personal defilement and uncleanness in GOD's sight[7]—which things separate man from GOD.[8]

In the New Testament sin is also described in terms expressive of the activity of the will and personality of man, which results in disunion. Of these the following are chief: a missing of the mark (*hamartia*); the spirit of lawlessness (*anomia*) and rebellion (*paranomia*); an injustice to GOD or man (*adikia*); something owed, a debt (*opheilēma, cf.* idea of duty and devoir); a false step (*paraptōma*); a cause of offence (*skandalon*); a darkness which the Light of the World reveals;[9] a bond from which one must be loosed;[10] a pollution from which one must be cleansed.[11] Such expressions emphasise the fact of sin as an activity of the will, the outcome of one's personality, responsible not only for deeds, but also for thoughts and words, and resulting in a spiritual separation from the SPIRIT of holiness, who convinces, convicts, and reproves it.[12] As we advance from the Old Testament to the New, morality grows in content and

[1] *Chattath* = ἁμαρτία. See Judg. xx. 16.
[2] *'Aon.* See Driver, "Sam.," 135 *n.* [3] *Pesha'.*
[4] *Ma'al.* [5] *Zedim.* [6] *Sh'gagah.*
[7] Job xv. 14-16.
[8] Isa. lix. 2: "Your iniquities have separated between you and your GOD."
[9] John iii. 20. [10] Rev. i. 5. [11] 1 John i. 7.
[12] Luke v. 8: "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O LORD." John xvi. 8: "He will convince the world of sin."

inwardness, and is regarded more and more as an activity of the human personality in relation to the Divine and to other human personalities, an offence against GOD or man—*e.g.*, "I have sinned against Heaven and in Thy sight,"[1] "How often shall my brother sin against me?"[2]

The originality of the LORD'S teaching with regard to sin is His emphasis on its inwardness, but more especially on the wrong relation of the world to His Personality it induced. "He (the HOLY SPIRIT) will reprove the world concerning sin, because they believe not on Me."[3] For He is the Light of the World, Who reveals its darkness.[4] But His doctrine of sin is not to be read apart from His revelation of forgiveness of sin as the attitude of the Holy FATHER towards sinners.

The responsibility of the individual is only emphasised as the ethics of Scripture become more spiritual—that is, as the human spirit, as distinguished from human society, comes into greater prominence. Both Jeremiah and Ezekiel reject a proverb that spoke of national responsibility (expressed in Lam. v. 7: "Our fathers have sinned ... and we have borne their iniquities") as opposed to individual. "In those days they shall say no more, The fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the children's teeth are set on edge. But every one shall die for his own iniquity; every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge."[5] And at the same time the universality of sin is assumed. "All we like sheep have gone astray"[6]—the Hebrew word here (*ta'ah*) often refers to sin—*e.g.*, Ps. cxix. 110; Prov. xxi. 16. "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves. . . . If

[1] Luke xv. 18-21.
[2] Matt. xviii. 21. *Cf.* Plato, "Phaedo," p. 242: *εἰς τὸ θεῖον.* Xenophon, "Hell.," 1. 7, 19: *εἰς θεούς.*
[3] John xvi. 9. [4] John iii. 20; viii. 12.
[5] Jer. xxxi. 29. *Cf.* Ezek. xviii. 2.
[6] Isa. liii. 6.

we say that we have not sinned, we make Him a liar."[1] But we do not find that the doctrine of original sin is taught with the same precision and authority as it is in Article IX. and in the various Confessions, Roman and Reformed,[2] by our LORD and His Apostles. Our LORD waived aside speculative questions touching the extent of salvation and the responsibility and punishment of man for his parents' sin.[3] According to Dr. Edersheim,[4] "What we may call the starting-point of Christian theology—the doctrine of hereditary guilt and sin through the fall of Adam, and of the consequent entire and helpless corruption of our nature—is entirely unknown to Rabbinical Judaism." But we challenge the statement that this doctrine is the starting-point of Christian theology.[5] As Dr. Dale observes in his "Christian Doctrine":[6] "The theory of the relation between Adam and his posterity, which is incidentally stated in Rom. v. 12-21, and 1 Cor. xv. 22, has no such organic relation to the general body of Christian truth. If these two passages had not been written, or if they had been lost, there is nothing in the rest of the New Testament to suggest this account of the effects of the sin of 'one man.'" St. Paul does not say how Adam's sin is related to our sin or nature; neither is he concerned to prove the origin of human sin and death, but to illustrate our moral solidarity in the righteousness and life of JESUS CHRIST. It is, how-

[1] 1 John i. 8, 10. *Cf.* texts declaring same fact: Matt. xv. 19; John iii. 3-7; especially Rom. vii. 18-24: "For I delight in the law of GOD after the inward man: but I see a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind."

[2] *E.g.*, Council of Trent, "Formula Concordiæ": Confessio Basiliensis, Helvetica, and Westminster.

[3] "Are there few that be saved?" (Luke xiii. 23). "Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" (John ix. 2).

[4] "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," vol. i., p. 52.

[5] Coleridge said practically the same thing ("Aids to Reflection," p. 215).

[6] Pp. 325-326.

ever, to be wished that the Scriptures had thrown more light on this doctrine of original sin, whether regarded formally as a deprivation of righteousness or supernatural grace,[1] or, materially, as a depravity of nature, or as both together, according to the "Formula Concordiæ," which states that "there is substituted for the lost image of GOD an intimate, most evil, most profound, inscrutable, ineffable corruption of our whole nature and all the powers." For its Scriptural warrant at present seems to be an erroneous translation of two Greek words, ἐφ' ᾧ,[2] rendered *in quo*. "Death passed upon all men, *for that*" (not *in whom*) "all sinned." For the Church professedly doth not apply the Apocryphal Books "to establish any doctrine." And it seems that it was in 2 Esdras iv. 30 that Augustine found it. Neither do the Scriptures reveal anything of the state of original righteousness. Adam is nowhere represented as perfect in canonical or patristic writings.[3] Irenæus described him as *nēpios, infans*. Clement of Alexandria said that "He was not made perfect in respect of his constitution, but in a fit condition to receive virtue."[4]

[1] Jon. Edwards ("Works," i. 217-219) held the privative view—namely, that our present state is due to the withdrawal of supernatural gifts. Oxenham regarded original sin as consisting in the deprivation of supernatural grace, and a consequent disorder of one's natural faculties; Bellarmine, as a loss of the similitude of God, the image being retained ("Catholic Doctrine of Atonement," p. 226).

[2] Rom. v. 12.

[3] Job xxxi. 33: "If, like Adam" (or after the manner of men, כְּאָדָם), "I covered my transgression" (*cf.* Hos. vi. 7), does not refer to such an inheritance, for sin here at most standeth in the following of Adam (Article IX.). Ps. li. 5: "In sin did my mother conceive me" (*cf.* Job xiv. 4) does not trace sin to Adam, but to a sexual relationship which was considered unclean. Eph. ii. 3: "Children of wrath by nature" (φύσει) does not establish original sin. The Apostle was speaking here of actual sin (Dr. T. K. Abbott, "Intern. Crit. Com."). In Rom. v. 12-21, 1 Cor. xv. 22, the Apostle St. Paul is not seeking to explain the cause of human sin or death, but to illustrate the righteousness and new life in CHRIST. 2 Esdras iv. 30: "A grain of evil seed was sown in the heart of Adam from the beginning, and how much wickedness hath it brought forth unto this time."

[4] "Strom.," vi. 12.

And while the New Testament regards all men as sinners, it throws no light on the method whereby they became such. If the cry of philosophy is "Back to Kant," the cry of religion is surely "Back to CHRIST." What has our LORD revealed on this subject? Our LORD at times referred to a hostile spiritual power: "I saw Satan fall"—He did not speak of a fall of man—"as a lightning flash from heaven." "The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in Me." "The enemy that sowed them is the devil." But He never alluded to Adam—a name found only in Rom. v. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 22, 45; 1 Tim. ii. 13, 14; and Jude 14. Neither did He treat children as vile[1] creatures under the ban of the FATHER, but as under His special care and blessing, for "their angels always behold the face of GOD." Did the Apostle St. John know anything of original sin, in the sense of a nature depraved and impure from birth? His summary of the Incarnation is the "Word became flesh" (*σάρξ*) unqualified. And the doctrine of original sin must affect the doctrine of the Incarnation. Dr. Du Bose, perceiving this, interprets the words of St. Paul "in the likeness of the flesh of sin" as equivalent to "our identical nature" not without sin, for he writes: "JESUS was humanly without sin only because He met and overcame and abolished sin in Himself"; and "He was not come to find or receive a sinless nature, but to redeem and save a sinful one; and He redeemed and saved it by His life in it. The nature was indeed sinless in Him, as He is in it; but it was sinless in Him because He was sinless in it, and not *vice versa*."[2] That is to say, the doctrine of original sin requires the sacrifice of the sinless nature of CHRIST. This is a remarkable *tour de force*.

[1] "Vile body" (Phil. iii. 21) is a mistranslation. It should be "body of humiliation," as contrasted with "glorious body."

[2] "Gospel according to St. Paul," p. 221; "High Priesthood," p. 221 and p. 78.

The Roman Church, seeing the weakness of this position, thought it necessary to invent another doctrine—that of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin—to support it. The position of St. Augustine[1]—"In Adam we all were at that time in the idea of GOD and in the seed of humanity, and therefore his disordered and vitiated nature has been propagated to us"—has been turned by Professor Caird,[2] who remarks "That the conception of seminal guilt, or of a sin which contains or involves all future sins, would imply that Adam was guilty of all the sins of his descendants, rather than they of his." The justice of this criticism is evident when we consider that responsibility cannot be thrown forward, but must be thrown back. The blossom is not responsible for the seed or for any of the intermediate stages of development. It was the Manichæan studies of the great Father, who was the first to treat the doctrine of sin scientifically,[3] that led him to regard human nature as depraved. The doctrine of the Fall of Man, which played so great a part in theology, is not found in the Scriptures of the New Testament. St. Paul speaks of a fall (*paraptōma*), but it is the fall of the Jews, which is the riches of the world;[4] and Simeon declared that the Child JESUS was set for "the fall (*ptōsin*) and rise of many in Israel."[5] But there is no connection of the doctrine of a fall with Adam. St. Paul, in 1 Tim. ii. 24, describes the sin of Eve as a transgression (*parabasis*), not as a fall (*paraptōma*). In these days, when the modern religious mind is compelled in its self-defence to test the bases of the faith and examine its bulwarks, it will not allow us to build upon any foundation that is liable to be destroyed or discredited by science or criticism. For while science repudiates the

[1] "De Civ.," xiii. 14.
[2] "Fundamental Ideas of Christianity," i. 210-211.
[3] So Oxenham admits ("Catholic Doctrine of Atonement," p. 25).
[4] Rom. xi. 12. [5] Luke ii. 34.

doctrine of a Fall as untrue,[1] criticism regards it as unnecessary.[2]

It may also be alleged that the doctrine of original sin —which does not belong to the body of Christian truth, having no place in the early creeds—has weakened the sense of responsibility for sins we have actually committed; while, on the other hand, it extends our responsibility to a state, or condition of things, for which we cannot be held responsible under any ethical system, and which would, humanly speaking, render us objects of compassion rather than of wrath. For if the evil that is in us can be traced back to some one universal moral catastrophe, moral evil, which is thus attributed to inherited bias, is extenuated. And if the consequences of sin be thus transmitted from man to man, why should not the consequences of righteousness be transmitted? It would be a sad thing for the human race if its moral inheritance were altogether bad. Again, it may be urged that the doctrine that we have inherited from Adam, whether we mean by the term one individual or the original ancestors of the human species,[3] a depraved or deprived nature gives support to pessimism and the idea that evil must prevail. For if one single offence could so vitiate the nature that GOD is represented as seeing the "very good,"[4] even though it was a test case, it would augur ill for the final success of good. Furthermore, the idea of the transmission of a sin imputable to man from

[1] See Sir Oliver Lodge, "Man and the Universe," p. 17.

[2] As Dr. John Hey, in his book on the "Articles" (ix., § 19), says: "Many serious and thinking Christians have judged that the first part of Genesis is not a literal description of fact, but an allegorical story, like the 'Pilgrim's Progress.'"

[3] Apropos of descent, it is interesting to note that Haeckel (whose attack on Christianity in chap. xvii. of the "Riddle" has been exposed and answered by Dr. Loofs) holds that life is from one root (monophyletic), whereas Darwin believed that there were four or five primitive forms of life (polyphyletic).

[4] Gen. i. 31.

the earliest times, and calling down GOD'S wrath and condemnation even upon those who cannot possibly have sinned in thought or deed, tends to throw sin into the external world; to give it an objectivity it has not; to treat it as a thing apart from one's personality, and to support those legal and forensic views of Atonement which sound theology and psychology alike reject. It also assumes, what cannot be proved, that "there may be an inheritance of sinful tendencies derived from sinful acts in the region of the spiritual personality."[1]

With regard to the transmission of "acquired characters," the question is still *sub judice*, according to Professor J. A. Thompson.[2] It has yet to be proved that a volitional act on the parent's part can *directly* affect the mind or body of the offspring. Professor Orr holds that evil dispositions—on the ground that evil is not an original endowment of human nature—are not natural, but have always a *voluntary origin*—at least, voluntary in the ultimate origin, which may "lie far behind the individual."[3] He assumes that "man is a bundle of inherited tendencies, and will in turn transmit his nature, with its new marks of good and evil, to those who come

[1] So Bishop Gore, "Romans II.," note E, p. 227. This savours of traducianism.

[2] Writing in the *London Quarterly Review*, January, 1902, he says: "Therefore we say that the scientific position at present should be one of *thätige Skepsis*, leading on to experiment, that we must at this date give a verdict of non-proven for the affirmative." See also "Heredity," chap. viii., of same author. Lamarck, Darwin, and Herbert Spencer built their theories on the assumption that such acquired characters are transmitted, the last writing: "Either there has been inheritance of acquired characters, or there has been no evolution" (Thompson, "Heredity," p. 195). Weismann opposes this view in his "Essays." See also Romanes, "Darwin and after Darwin." See also Tennant, "The Origin of Sin," p. 36: "The question turns entirely on the transmission of acquired modifications, as distinguished from congenital variations. . . . The conviction very largely prevails amongst the authorities that unequivocal instances of such transmission have never yet been supplied."

[3] *Expositor*, September, 1910.

after him."[1] This bold assumption is fatal to individual life, personality, and responsibility, while it demands too much for the racial life.

Congenital tendencies to indulge certain instincts and impulses may, like predispositions to certain physical diseases and certain parental proclivities, be handed down from generation to generation, and in this sense the modern Christian mind interprets the doctrine of original sin; but the assertion that such carry with them guilt, unless deliberately indulged in, is open to the objection that guilt,[2] which originally implied liability to punishment, but now signifies moral blameworthiness, "answerableness," or imputability, can only exist where there are conditions that make for responsibility, such as freedom and knowledge. In primitive times, when the self had not yet developed from the tribal into the personal, and the tribe was answerable for the crimes of the individual, there was a solidarity of guilt, so to speak; but in an age of strongly developed individualism—a higher stage of ethical life—such a conception must be modified. There are public and corporate responsibilities, in the sense that the liabilities of a sin are shared and inherited, though its answerableness cannot be. But it is to the personality that we look for the redemption of the individual life from such liabilities. Our conscience is not primitive, but Christian. And even Judaism in the persons of Jeremiah and Ezekiel resented a solidarity of guilt. Personality, which is the key of the problem, is not inherited. It goes deeper than race. Good and evil dispositions are therefore, whatever their ultimate origin may be, voluntary in the individual's life.

And as the individual cannot be held accountable for

[1] "Christian View of God," p. 198.

[2] A.S. *gyldan*, to pay. Hegel defines it ("Philosophy of Religion," iii. 48) as possibility of imputation or imputability; Bradley ("Ethical Studies," p. 3) as "answerableness."

the condition into which he is born or for the character or vocation of his parents, he cannot be regarded as answerable for the nature he is given, whether it be good or evil, vitiated by inherent tendencies to evil or strengthened by predispositions to virtue.

Furthermore, theologians admit that "sin" must bear a different connotation when used in the phrase "original sin" from that implied when actual sin is concerned.[1] And after all is said, we must admit that "sin or holiness cannot be in mere nature or condition, they can only be in what *we* are or do in the nature or the condition."[2]

On the other hand, one must reject an atomistic view of life and personality. We must not fall into the error of Pelagius, and overlook the influence of sinful habit on the will. We are not in the same position with regard to evil after as before. Neither are we separate units, but members of a body, so that, as Schleiermacher has said, "Sin is in each the work of all, and in all the work of each." For we are connected with the past life, the present condition, and the future hope of the race. To the physical or organic unity of the race we owe our instincts and impulses, appetites and passions, in stronger or weaker form. This is our universal inheritance—the material out of which the will makes good or evil, and which are not in themselves good or evil until they have been made so by the will. Here is ground both for individual freedom and for universal sinfulness. Personality is spiritual and subjective. That which influences or injures the personality is something that the will has appropriated and made its own, such as a maxim, a desire, an impulse. Heredity in the sense of inheritance by descent cannot be made responsible for what takes place in this sphere, if psychology and physiology are to

[1] H. S. V. Eck, "Sin" (Oxford Library of Practical Theology).
[2] Du Bose, "The Gospel according to St. Paul," p. 221.

be kept distinct. But, on the other hand, the consequences of human sin, physical and moral, are transmitted from generation to generation. There is an inheritance of trouble, trial, and sorrow. Furthermore, the moral environment—that great complex of surrounding influences which is in a measure the product of inherited tendencies and previous conditions of life—has an untold influence upon the human soul. The moral history of man is the record of his struggle with the circumstances, surroundings, and conditions of his life. There is a social, moral, and religious atmosphere, as well as a physical, to be taken into account by the student of mankind. The traditions, principles, thoughts, ideas, aspirations, feelings, and sentiments of the social world into which we are born—these constitute the most serious element in our surroundings, the most important factor in the making, moulding, or marring of our manhood. In this conflict, as in the struggle of physical nature, only the fittest survive. Only those who strive to keep above the tone and trend of their social environment are morally saved and help to save others. Those who sink to the level of their moral environment are morally lost. In our judgment of a man, all the conditions and circumstances of his life, all the influences and surroundings that make up his moral environment, must be taken into account. Much is expected of those who have been brought up in a pure and pious environment. As David Elginbrod remarked, "People have a hantle to answer for who come of decent forbears." On the other hand, those less fortunate must be treated with more compassion. There are extenuating circumstances to be considered. For as the same philosopher remarked, "What is a wilfu' sin in the father may be a sinfu' weakness in the son." A man born in sordid surroundings and bred in vicious surroundings, who fights hard against his

natural inclinations and his evil habits, and tries to do what is right, is a nobler hero than the man who, brought up in a stricter school, finds it comparatively easy to be good.

Moreover, the human race being one organism, there is a racial evil in which the race as a whole is involved, and in the effects or liabilities of which it shares. This solidarity of man in sin seems to be the contradiction of personal responsibility. But these truths are reconcilable. They emphasise different aspects of human life—the solidarity of the human life in its relations to others, and the individuality, or singleness, of the human life in relation to its own soul. There is a personal and a social, an inner and an outer, aspect of our nature. On the one hand, we are relieved of the burden of our sins and sufferings by others owing to the solidarity of humanity. But we are only completely relieved when the personal element comes in, when we identify ourselves with such assistance, and feel personally responsible for such atonement, when the self in man is completely changed, not only by the SPIRIT of GOD, but also by his identification of himself with a better character, a holier spirit. St. Paul emphasises the solidarity of man in ruin, in order to show how much more transcending and glorious is the solidarity of man in redemption. But neither ruin nor redemption are our very own until we have made them ours by personal identification. The "racial act" in neither case involves the individual completely unless, unlike the Apothecary in *Romeo and Juliet*, his will consents. The freedom of the human will is the explanation of the apparent antinomy between personal and inherited responsibility. On the other hand, an atomistic conception of personality, which imagines humanity to be divided into water-tight compartments, incapable of influencing or being influenced by each other, is opposed to the idea of an Atonement

which presupposes the unity of human life and its solidarity, and accordingly a common and universal responsibility. Biology, however, has come to the rescue of religion, by showing such a conception to be opposed to fact. The solidarity of mankind connects the crimes and sorrows of each with the crimes and sorrows of all.[1] The degradation of the community drags down the individual; the degradation of the individual drags down the community. For no man liveth to himself. To the influences of social heredity and moral solidarity we owe, to a large extent, the making and marring of our lives and characters. And yet the Bishop of London has borne witness to the fact that girls have grown up as pure as the lily amid the vilest surroundings. These things do not necessitate guilt, much less constitute it, neither do they relieve us of individual responsibility. But they show that freedom is conditioned by nurture; and demonstrate the possibility of the universality of sin.

While recognising the physical unity and continuity of the race and its moral solidarity, modern thought resents the slightest approach to traducianism, or the idea that we have derived our souls as well as our bodies from our parents—an idea that strikes, not only at the Divine source of spiritual life, but at the moral basis of human personality, and which may be regarded as the ecclesiastical counterpart of Haeckel's embryology of the soul.[2] The prevalence of sin is rather due to the fact that the human will has not the strength to rise above its surroundings. The issue seems, therefore, to lie between a theory of inborn sin and a theory of inbred sin; of nature and nurture; inheritance and environment. Had the early

[1] *Cf.* Royce, "The World and the Individual," ii. 389: "The solidarity of man links the crimes of each to the sorrows of all."

[2] "Riddle of the Universe," chap. viii.: "Each of these sexual cells —ovum and spermatozoon—has its own cell-soul; that is, each is distinguished by a peculiar form of sensation and movement."

theologians laid more stress upon the influences of social heredity and environment, moral solidarity and nurture, than on the transmission of a corrupted human nature, they would probably have had a more enduring, as well as a more exalted, explanation of the baptismal regeneration of infants, in the initiation into a new spiritual environment, on which the name of the FATHER, SON, and SPIRIT rests in grace and benediction, and in which, Christian nurture, training, and influence strengthen the will in its battle with the world, sin, and self. This view lays emphasis on the principle of involution, which is as necessary to growth as evolution, the one being the unfolding of that which is within, the other the infolding of that which is without. The spirit cannot live in a spiritual vacuum. The raising into a new spiritual life is a higher conception than the cutting off the entail of prenatal guilt.

Sin is not only a matter of experience, it is a subject of revelation. But as every philosophical system is obsessed with sin as a recognised element in life, philosophy which is based on psychology supports revelation. This ought to suffice us. And we must be thankful in these days of "Determinism" that the Scriptures have spoken in such clear tones on the individual's responsibility for sin, and at the same time do not make him responsible for the moral disorder in which the sinfulness of the human race has thrown the world.

But the doctrine of Atonement is not affected by any theory of the origin of sin. Whether we regard our present sinful state as a chaos not yet formed into order or the ruin of a once fair creation, it is independent of the theory of "a mysterious seed of sin implanted in the human race,"[1] and, "like other characteristics of the race, capable of transmission"; or any theories of the Fall or Evolution

[1] Sanday and Headlam, "Romans," pp. 146 147.

as explanations of our condition, because it is concerned with our moral condition as it is, not with explanations of it. The existence of the universality of sin and sinful habit is sufficient basis for a Gospel of redemption, a redemption of our wills and our souls, quite apart from the further question—into which the Redeemer never entered—how sinfulness arose.

Having treated the subject from a Scriptural standpoint, we now deal with it from the view-point of philosophy. While philosophy has thrown various lights upon the subject of sin and its origin, of which theology must take note, it has brought into greater prominence the subjective nature of sin, regarding it as the problem of the human personality. The various solutions of this problem help forward a study of its Atonement or forgiveness.

The great system from which we start is Kant's. In his revolt against the "Illumination," which treated the problem with complacency and denied all internal conviction of guilt,[1] he emphasised its importance in his "Critique of Practical Reason"[2] and "Metaphysic of Morals," and laid the foundation of future ethic in the striking sentence: "Nothing can possibly be conceived in the world, or out of it, which can be called good without qualification except the good will."[3] Good and evil are, therefore, predicable of will, and of will alone, and sin is traced back to the will of man. But he discovers a propensity to evil, a radical badness of human nature, a propensity which "must itself be considered morally bad, and consequently not as a natural property, but as something that can be imputed to the man, and consequently must consist in maxims of the will which are

[1] Ritschl, "Justification and Reconciliation," i. 387.

[2] "Theory of Ethics," Abbott's Trans., p. 127, where he speaks of the ill desert which accompanies the transgression of a moral law.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

opposed to the law. . . . It may be called a radical badness in human nature, innate, but not the less drawn upon us by ourselves."[1]

This is not the doctrine of original sin, for though Kant acknowledges the universality of this perversity, he declares that its origin is inscrutable to us;[2] although the corruption of our supreme maxim is our own act, we cannot imagine any further cause for it. He denies that the source of badness can be placed in the sensibility of man and the natural inclinations springing therefrom. These have no direct reference to badness. They afford the occasion for the moral character to show its virtue.[3] Nor are we responsible for their existence; as they were implanted in us, they have not us for their authors. Whereas we are accountable for the propensity to evil, for this is found in the subject as a freely acting being, and must be imputed to him as his own fault, although it is so deeply rooted in the elective will that it must be said to be found in man by nature.[4] Neither does the moral evil consist in a corruption of the reason, for it concerns the will, which has a tendency to adopt the impulses of the sense-nature rather than the dictates of reason into its maxims or subjective ruling principles. This is an inversion of the true order, the legislative will being subordinated to the sensibility. This bias is evil; it is radical badness, and its rational as opposed to its temporal origin lies in the noumenal sphere in an intelligible, timeless act of choice, for it is as supersensible beings that we are free from the physical law of

[1] "Theory of Ethics," Abbott's Trans., pp. 335-339. Kant dealt a hard blow to the optimistic view of Rousseau concerning the inherent goodness of human nature.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 351.

[3] *Cf.* Aristotle's "Ethics," ii. 2. He would have the passions educated and cultivated, whereas the Stoics would have them rooted out. *Cf.* also Butler, "Sermon V."

[4] "Theory of Ethics," Abbott's Trans., p. 342.

causality. Kant thus creates a false dualism of man as noumenon and man as phenomenon, a radical rift in human nature, to explain its radical badness and man's responsibility for his bias to evil.

Although ignoring such factors of experience as the influence of heredity, environment, the moral solidarity of the race, and the psychological development of the individual, Kant has made a valuable contribution to the discussion in his clear enunciation of the moral imperative,[1] and in his insistence on the principle that moral evil can only have its origin in a misuse of personal freedom, the presupposition of the consciousness of guilt. According to Ritschl, he "established critically—that is, with scientific strictness—those general presuppositions of the idea of reconciliation which lie in the consciousness of moral freedom and moral guilt."[2] But his "typic of the practical judgment" is only a negative test, and falls short of the Golden Rule.

With regard to the doctrine of original sin, he considers it "the most unsuitable"[3] of all views on the subject, as it implies the transmission of moral qualities by natural generation, which would trace sin to the world of cause, it being a contradiction of his principles to seek for a time-origin of free actions as such.

But he is not clear or helpful when treating of the reformation of human life. He asked "if a man is corrupt in the very foundation of his maxims, how is it possible that he should effect this change by his own power and become a good man?"[4] And he answers:

[1] "Act as if the principle by which you act were by your will to be made a universal law." While Haeckel treats the Golden Rule as the highest precept of morality, he says of the Kantian precept: "Modern anthropology has ruthlessly dissipated that pretty dream that all normal men have the same sense of duty" ("Riddle of the Universe," chap. xix.).

[2] "Justification and Reconciliation," i. 408.

[3] "Theory of Ethics," Abbott's Trans., p. 347. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 356.

"Duty commands it, and duty commands nothing that is not practicable for us. We ought; therefore we can." Again, he asks: "Is not this restoration of one's life opposed to the thesis of the innate corruption of man for everything good?"[1] He answers that the thesis of innate evil does not apply to *dogmatic* morality, but to the *culture* of morality, where it means no more than this, that in the moral cultivation of the moral capacity for good we cannot begin from a natural state of innocence, but must presuppose the depravity of the elective will in assuming maxims that are contrary to the original moral capacity, and since the propensity thereto is ineradicable, with an unceasing effort against it.[2] And yet Kant declares that the man's action is still free, no matter what the natural causes influencing him; and when we inquire into the *rational* origin of every bad action, he states, it must be viewed as if a man fell into it from a state of innocence.[3] It seems, then, that we fall like gods. And although the radical badness in our nature prevents us from rising, Divine assistance is withheld from us. He writes: "It is not essential, and therefore not necessary, for one to know what GOD does or has done for his salvation, but it is essential to know what he himself has to do in order to be worthy of His assistance."[4] No wonder the task is insuperable and the propensity ineradicable. It would be just here that the doctrine of the Atonement would give a man help, by purifying and strengthening the will. It would seem that Kant's assumption of innate moral badness has put a dead-weight upon his ethical system and human life, from which neither can arise without the assistance he withholds from them. To the desire to safeguard man's freedom or independence of the law of causality as

[1] "Theory of Ethics," Abbott's Trans., p. 358.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 359.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 348.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 360.

noumenon, he has sacrificed man's nature and prospects as *phenomenon;* in other words, the form of morality has been asserted in terms detrimental to its material—the logical result of reducing the matter to mere "Schein."

Kant is followed by Dr. Julius Müller, whose "Christian Doctrine of Sin" is the most exhaustive work on the subject. He also held an "innate propensity to evil, which can only have its ground in a free falling away, in one's own offence."[1] He rejected the ecclesiastical theory of original sin, because the notion of sin, as a term only attributable to the self-determination of the individual, is here impossible. There can be no guilt attaching to such an inheritance, nor even to the actual sins arising from it.[2] As Kant sought the origin of sin in the supra-sensible sphere, in the act of the transcendental as opposed to the empirical self, Müller finds it in an extra-temporal mode of existence and fall. This scheme, which recalls the Platonic myth in the *Phaedrus* of the soul's fall from a celestial sphere to the earth, the primal fall in the *Pleroma* of Valentinus, and Origen's pre-natal sin, looks for an original self-decision in a sphere where self-determination is unconditioned, and has consequently to overleap the bounds of temporal life. Here and now we are subject "to a successive development, in which every moral moment appears as a mixed result of free self-determination, and dependence upon the previously developed."[3] If we would therefore have "perfect equipoise of oppositely determined impulses," we must seek it in a region of unconditioned self-determination. In the first place we observe that the importance attached in this system to this original self-decision, and its influence upon the human life, tends to lay too much stress upon the first remembered act of evil choice in the temporal sphere, and

[1] *Ibid.*, ii. 284. [2] *Ibid.*, ii. 340.
[3] *Ibid.*, ii. 73.

to regard the decision made when the moral consciousness was weakest as most guilty of all. Furthermore, the individual "sin-fall," which he postulates as the origin of sin, being an act of pure unconditioned self-determination, is not only more incomprehensible in a state in which man is free from his sensuous nature, the chief source of his temptations and sins here, but supplies a basis of sin so arbitrary as to be inconsistent with universality. He admits this. "We are obliged to acknowledge that evil . . . since it attains reality by an act of arbitrariness as an abruption from the rational ground and connexion, is according to its essential ground, incomprehensible."[1] Müller only puts the difficulty of explaining the origin of sin further back, and substitutes a celestial for a terrestrial Pelagianism.

Coleridge, in "Aids to Reflection," traces sin, like Kant and Müller, to the will, the corrupt nature of this will being the condition and common ground of all sin.[2] But this will, for him, is not an individual will, but a universal will, and original sin is "a timeless act" of all human wills collectively. Adam is not an individual, but the human race. And accordingly, "in respect of original sin, every man is the adequate representative of all men."[3] Adam's fall is treated as a typical experience which every man must pass through. And yet the theory of a universal will, though doubtless intended to express the moral solidarity and unity of the race, tends to bring the subject into greater mystery, relieving the individual of personal responsibility by making sin a racial rather than an individual concern.

In contrast with these theories of sin, which trace its origin to the free will, and in consequence of their failure

[1] *Ibid.*, ii. 189. [2] P. 180.
[3] P. 192. Coleridge's remark on original sin has already been noticed.

to reach any definite conclusion, or to throw any clear light on the mystery, other philosophical views postulate sin as a necessity in the nature of things, in human life, and even in GOD. Schelling traces the necessity of evil to GOD; but Hegel finds it in man. According to the latter, man must pass from innocence (thesis) to sin (antithesis) in order to reach virtue (synthesis); for the experience of sin must be gained in the progress from moral ignorance to moral knowledge. But even though sin must be always followed by retribution and amendment before virtue can be reached, this theory leads to a mitigated view of sin, which can hardly be moral, and is certainly not theological, and indeed is devoid of "reality" in this system, which is based on a confusion of an intellectual recognition of virtue, to which the opposite concept may be necessary, with a moral realisation of virtue, to which the conquest of its opposite is essential. Dr. McTaggart thus sums up Hegel's doctrine of sin: "Defects, error, sin are for Hegel only imperfectly real. All sin is for Hegel relatively good. . . . Christianity habitually attaches enormous importance to the idea of sin. . . . This idea is entirely alien to Hegel. The real difficulty lies in Hegel's treatment of sin as something relatively good.[1] . . . There is no trace in Hegel of any feeling of absolute humility and contrition of man before GOD. Indeed, it would be scarcely possible that there should be. Sin for Hegel is so much less real than man, that it is impossible for man ever to regard himself as altogether sinful. Sin is a mere appearance. Like all appearance, it is based on reality. But the reality it is based on is not sin. Like all reality, it is perfectly good. The sinfulness is part of the appearance. Every man is a perfect manifestation of GOD. He would not be such a manifestation of GOD, indeed, if he were taken in isolation, but being taken in the community, he embodies GOD perfectly. Such a

[1] "Studies in Hegelian Cosmology," pp. 218-243.

being is perfect in his own right, and sin is superficial with regard to him, as it is with regard to the Absolute. *Sub specie eternitatis*, he is sinless. *Sub specie temporis*, he is destined to become sinless, not from any external gift of Divine grace, but because he is man—and GOD.[1]

The whole passage recalls Spinoza's views of repentance and sin: "Repentance is not a virtue, and does not arise from reason; but he who repents of an action is doubly wretched and infirm."[2] But the note on this proposition is that "as men seldom live under the guidance of reason, these two emotions—namely, humility and repentance, as also hope and fear—bring more good than harm; hence, as we must sin, we had better sin in that direction." Sin, however, has no reality in this system. "As for the terms *good* and *bad*, they indicate no positive quality in things regarded in themselves, but are merely modes of thinking, or notions which we form from the comparison of things one with another. Thus, one and the same thing can be at the same time good, bad, and indifferent."[3] "As modes of thought, good and evil, they have no reality, and are purely relative. And if the mind possessed only adequate ideas, it would form no conception of evil."[4] Spinoza approached the subject from the standpoint of "GOD as the immanent cause of all things,"[5] the *causa sui* and the *causa causati*, for His intellect is the sole cause of things, both of their essence and existence."[6] His view, no matter how inadequate, is devoid of the coarseness of the materialists, who, approaching the subject from the standpoint of Nature, seem to exult in the thought that there is no such thing as sin, or free-will, or justice in punishment.[7] And there is a sense in which we can

[1] "Studies in Hegelian Cosmology," pp. 243, 244.
[2] "Ethics," iv. 54. [3] *Ibid.*, iv., Pref.
[4] *Ibid.*, iv. 64. [5] *Ibid.*, i. 18. [6] *Ibid.*, i. 17.
[7] "Ethics are transformed into a bill of fare" (Luthardt, "Fundamental Truths of Christianity," p. 131; E. T.). Mr. Blatchford, in the *Clarion*, is a well-known offender.

accept his statement, "*Good* is that which we certainly know to be a means of approaching more nearly to the type of human nature which we have set before us."[1]

Materialism, striking at the root of freedom, has felled the tree of human personality, and with it responsibility, guilt, and redemption. For how is an automaton affected by ethical notions? In every philosophical system in which the Divine personality and the human are inadequately conceived, there is a correspondingly inadequate conception of sin and its atonement, as there is in the already evanescent "New Theology" of our own day. This is manifest in Hegel's conception of the manner in which the self becomes conscious of itself, and again loses itself in the Universal Self. Evil, which, according to this philosophy, has no reality, but is purely relative, is regarded by him as a necessary experience in the moral development of man. Dr. McTaggart,[2] who himself regards sin as something relative, in explaining the Hegelian position, says: "In the long run sin must always disgust the person who commits it. You have only to go on sinning long enough to have it borne in on you with an ever-increasing force that it is not in this way that self-satisfaction is to be found." Thus, experience brings home to the self that it cannot find satisfaction in sin. In this way the advance from innocence to virtue is explained, and sin declared to be a necessary means to virtue. If this does not mean that to possess a particular virtue we must indulge in the corresponding vice, but that sin must lead to increase of virtue, and that there is no virtue which is not based on sin, the doctrine is less injurious to morality than it seems.

With regard to the natural state of man, Hegel writes: "The Christian doctrine that man is by nature evil is loftier than the opposite, that he is naturally good." He

[1] "Ethics," iv., Preface. [2] "Hegelian Cosmology," p. 151.

interprets this philosophically. Man as spirit is a free being, who is master of his impulses. This is how he ought to be. But as he is by nature unformed and undeveloped, he is as he ought not to be. And he must free himself. "This," he declares, "is the meaning of the doctrine of original sin, without which Christianity would not be the religion of freedom."[1] The Biblical conception of the Fall represents "not merely a kind of accidental history, but rather the everlasting necessary history of mankind."[2] The story means that man ought not to be natural, and that he must advance from that state by an exercise of his freedom, his will. To persist in his natural condition would be evil. What is innocence to the beast is not innocence to man, because he is a being possessed of will. He must therefore emerge from that stage by an exercise of his will. Even a deliberate choice of evil, implying an activity of the will, is superior to a state of innocence, and is a stage nearer to virtue. This view of original sin and the Fall as the mode in which man develops from a state of nature into a person is not the conventional.

As regards his view of sin in general, if we may be permitted to understand by real not only the natural, but also the spiritually true, there is much to be said for the view that evil, as regarded as isolation, is unreal. And if we adopt his view that sin has its root in selfishness, in a separation from the universal, a disunion which is the source of evil, and in which "independent Being, or Being-for-Self, originates," it is not in the Hegelian, but in the ordinary acceptation of these terms.[3] For sin is the

[1] "Philosophy of Right," Dyde's Trans., 18.

[2] "Philosophy of Religion," i. 275 *et seq.*; E. T. (Spiers and Sanderson).

[3] *Ibid.*, iii. 53: "To be evil means, in an abstract sense, to isolate myself." Also iii. 49: "It is in that disunion that independent Being, or Being-for-Self, originates, and it is in it that evil has its seat; here is the source of evil."

assertion of a false independence, which is not necessary to virtue, but is a positive hindrance to development, and is more than a mistake due to ignorance of the self. Dr. McTaggart maintains that Hegel's theory does not deny the difference between virtue and sin, nor affirms that sin is the greater good of the two, and that for this reason it is harmless to morality. This is a negative position, and marks the parting of the ways between Hegelian and Christian thought. "To go further," he says, "and to condemn sin as absolutely and positively bad is useless to morality and fatal to religion."[1] There is a great difference between the Hegelian sense of sin and the Christian. And yet is it not true for the latter that sin eventually must disappear when GOD shall be all in all? being set aside "as null and void," even though he will not accept the position that, in plain terms, no difference is left between goodness and badness,"[2] for he must always regard sin as something which ought not to be.

The Neo-Hegelian school also regard sin as a necessary step in the attainment of goodness. "The turbidity of the waters," writes Dr. Edward Caird,[3] "only proves that the angel has come down to trouble them, and the important thing is that when so disturbed they have a healing virtue." This is hardly to distinguish virtue from sin. For the eternal self-consciousness sin cannot exist, it is argued, in the sense of Kant or Christianity. It is taken up and absorbed in the universal life or consciousness. "The imperfection," writes Mr. Nettleship, "which in man is never wholly overcome, but remains a positive and final fact separating him from GOD, exists in GOD not as sin, but as an element in the Divine perfection, in

[1] "The Hegelian Cosmology," p. 174.
[2] "Appearance and Reality," p. 439; Bradley.
[3] "Evolution of Religion," i. 231.

which its finality, and therefore its sinfulness, is done away."[1] Mr. Bradley affirms that there is nothing good or bad for the Absolute, of which neither thought, will, personality, nor morality may be predicated.[2] While Dr. McTaggart, in his attempt to build up a scheme of morality independent of religion, attacks the omnipotence and goodness of GOD on the ground of the existence of evil in the world. Omnipotence surely is bound by the laws of identity, contradiction, and the excluded middle. Two and two must make four for Deity. For "omnipotence is not the power to realise a contradiction." The existence of evil in itself may be a proof of the Divine personality and omnipotence of GOD. For self-limitation, which involves the contrast between an *ego* and a *non-ego*, implying not only a self-distinguishing consciousness, but also a self-determining will, is of the essence of personality. And the existence of evil in the world is surely a stronger proof of such self-imposed limitation or self-abnegation of GOD'S unlimited and unconditioned infinitude than it is of impotence to cope with a prevailing opposition which, according to the teaching of this very school, is eventually merged in the universal life. This self-limitation is more apparent in regard of the human personality, in relation to which GOD is transcendent rather than immanent, than in the lower spheres of life, where He is immanent rather than transcendent.[3]

Furthermore, to deny or doubt the omnipotence and goodness of GOD because of the existence of evil is (1) to suppose that evil which, according to Hegel's theory, in the form of sin must lead to increase of virtue, holds its own in spite of GOD'S will in the universe; (2) to assume

[1] "Memoir," p. 94.
[2] "Appearance and Reality," p. 41.
[3] See Martineau, "Study of Religion," ii. 179.

that because GOD does not extinguish evil after the manner prescribed by the philosopher, that He is powerless to do so; (3) to overlook, on the one hand, the possibility of the Almighty Creator having an all-orderly mind as well as an all-powerful will, and having the independence to prescribe a plan of procedure for Himself; and (4) on the other hand, the possibility of the philosopher's improved scheme leading to the reduction of this fair cosmos of created life, the regularity of which is brought home to us in those occasional catastrophes, physical and moral, which illuminate the order they interrupt, to a chaos of disorderly chances, or a medley of arbitrary interventions.

Instead of affording the refutation of Theism, no matter how it requires to be restated,[1] the existence of evil may,

[1] Professor James, in "A Pluralistic Universe," contrasts the philosophy of idealistic monism with his own theory of *pluralism*. The principal difference is that monism (or "absolutism") believes that substance becomes fully divine only in the form of totality, and is only its real self in the *all*-form; whereas pluralism doubts whether there may ultimately be an *all*-form at all, and considers that "a distributive form of reality, the *each*-form, is logically as acceptable and empirically as probable as the *all*-form" (p. 34). "For monism the world is no collection, but one great, all-inclusive fact, outside of which there is nothing; and when the monism is *idealistic*, this all enveloping fact is represented as an *absolute mind that makes the partial facts by thinking them*." "This is the *full pantheistic scheme*, the immanence of GOD in His creation, a conception sublime from its tremendous unity." Pluralism, on the other hand, holds that "reality may exist in a distributive form in the shape, not of an *all*, but of a set of *eaches*"; in favour of which it is urged that these *eaches* "are, at any rate, real enough to have made themselves at last *appear* to everyone, whereas the absolute has as yet appeared immediately to only a few mystics, and, indeed, to them very ambiguously" (p. 129). We are thus left to decide between a universe consisting of one single ponderous "All," and one comprising an infinite number of miscellaneous *eaches*. The philosophy of the Absolute, indeed, fails to reconcile the rationality of the whole with the irrationality of the parts, and to explain the lapse of the Absolute from perfection to imperfection. The All-knower must know of and be always conscious of, not only every fact and relation of each object, but also what the object is not. "The rubbish in its mind would thus appear easily to outweigh

accordingly, be the proof of a Divine personality, by whose mind physical evil is revealed as a disorder which must eventually be removed, and by whose holiness moral evil is made manifest as that which ought not to be—not which cannot not-be—and which must finally be overcome; and both are found to be incidental, and not essential to the process of the Divine purposes.

The theories—Hegelian and Neo-Hegelian—reviewed ignore the Biblical consciousness of sin, which in its emphasis on the personality, Divine and human—"Against *Thee, Thee* only, have I sinned, and done this evil in Thy sight"[1]—might have saved man from the confusion of GOD as the ultimate ground of all finite spirits with the Absolute, as the whole of reality, and from denuding GOD and man of real personality or selfhood.[2]

On the other hand, Ritschl, whose views are widely prevalent in our day, professes to start from such a consciousness of sin, but arrives at a conclusion similar to

---

in amount the more desirable material" (p. 128). And what about the things that are impure, indecent, wicked, and treacherous, which are thought-forms of the Absolute equally as their opposites? A pluralistic metaphysic, on the other hand, may avoid the eccentricities of the Absolute by explaining the whole by the parts, and regarding the superhuman consciousness called GOD, no matter how vast, as finite, and having an external environment. But it sacrifices both the immanence and omnipotence of GOD, and, like the older dualistic theism—like every other form of dualism—"the evil enemy of all philosophic thought" (Rülf, "Metaphysik," vi., Gotteseinheit, p. 438) that kept the external Creator aloof and distinct, *toto genere*, from His creatures; that treated man as the subject of a supreme magistrate instead of as the child of a Heavenly FATHER, is inferior to the newer Theomonism, or the theistic view of a GOD both immanent and transcendent, which gives the Divine a more intimate and organic relation to the universe and man, and, without absorbing the human personality in the Divine, assigns to the latter a supremacy which is infinite, a reality which is ultimate (see "Theomonism True," by F. Ballard, chap. vi.).

[1] Ps. li. 4. The Greek is even more emphatic: σοὶ μόνῳ ἥμαρτον.

[2] See Dr. James Ward, "Naturalism and Agnosticism."

Hegel's. According to him, it is the gospel of the forgiveness of sins that is actually the ground of the knowledge of our sinfulness.[1] It is by the light of CHRIST'S revelation that we see the real nature of sin. He formally traces sin, after the manner of Kant, to the "self-determination of the individual will."[2] He recognises two classes of sin—"sin as ignorance," which is pardonable, and "sin as final decision against recognised good," which is problematical,[3] and to be annihilated. This distinction, however, is for GOD, not for man. And remembering the love GOD has for sinners, we ought not to judge, but "to be satisfied with comprehending all these instances of sin under the negative category of sin as ignorance."[4] Nay, further, he palliates sin. "It is an apparently inevitable product of the human will under the conditions of its development, but conscious as we are of our freedom and independence, is nevertheless reckoned by us as guilt."[5] Sin is accordingly not only to be regarded as ignorance, but also as inevitable. Our LORD pleaded for His murderers on the ground that they knew not what they did, and "His estimate of sin as ignorance must be accepted with due reverence."[6]

As it was from Schleiermacher that the founder of "theology without metaphysics" has taken over the idea of sin as a common or collective evil, it will be necessary to say a few words on his system. That theologian affected to believe in original sin and to hold that "in all men actual sin is the outcome of original sin."[7] But as he held a similar "unborn sinfulness" in Adam, his view of original sin is not the usual one. He resolves the *Erbsünde* into the collective deed and collective guilt of the human race, for "sin is in all points a thing of

[1] "Justification and Reconciliation," p. 327.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 249.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 377.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 379.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 360.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 379.
[7] "Der Christliche Glaube," p. 73.

society" . . . "in each the work of all, in all the work of each,"[1] and the "universal sense of the need of redemption."[2] Schleiermacher emphasised the influence of social environment in his explanation of the propagation of sin. The actual sin of surrounding society is the source of original sin, of which our actual sin is the outcome. Sin is thus a matter of nurture rather than of nature, and is due to the influences of environment. Here Ritschl follows in his view of humanity as the sum of all individuals, as contrasted with the individual, as the proper subject of sin. And for the ecclesiastical doctrine of original sin, which he rejects for many reasons, he substitutes the conception of a kingdom of evil, opposed to the kingdom of God, his leading idea.[3] This "web of sinful action and reaction" is a factor to be taken into account. But to say that humanity is sinful does not explain sin in the man. The universality of sin was assumed in order to account for its existence in the individual; doubtless because he saw it was impossible to explain it. He has, however, done theology some service, (1) in the manner in which he emphasises the solidarity of humanity in his treatment of sin as a social or racial matter; (2) in his separation of theology from metaphysics; (3) in his firm insistence on the personality of GOD, and (4) in his derivation of his theology from the historical Person of CHRIST, in order, no doubt, to avoid His transcendental nature. However, there are notable gaps in the system. He excludes the idea of retribution or Divine punishment from his system; he regards a

[1] "Der Christliche Glaube," pp. 70, 71.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 71. "Die Erbsünde ist aber zugleich" (at the same time) "so sehr die eigene Schuld eines Jeden, der daran Theil hat, dass sie am besten als die Gesammttheil und Gesammtschuld des menschlichten Geschlechtes vorgestellt wird, und dass ihre Anerkennung zugleich die der allgemeinen Erlösungsbedürftigkeit ist" (71, S. 381).

[3] "Justification and Reconciliation," p. 344.

"final and thoroughgoing opposition to GOD" as beyond redemption, whereas the realisation of such a state may be the promise and potency of reform; and he fails to do justice to the Christian consciousness of sin in representing it as "ignorance." For the doctrine of original inherited sin he substituted the social heredity of evil influences. He traced sin, not only to the will, but to acts of the will. "As a personal bias in the life of the individual, it originates, so far as we are able to observe, in sinful desire and *action*, which as such has its sufficient ground in the self-determination of the individual will.[1] Children have no inherited bias to sin. But the universality of sin is due in a large measure to ignorance and perverted social influences. The sinful act, however, reacts upon the will and creates a sinful propensity, which develops into a sinful habit, and finally into a sinful character. And, socially, it affects the other members of the community.

But he lays stress on another aspect of sin as guilt—the sense of dissatisfaction with oneself, and the feeling of separation from GOD which accompanies the consciousness of guilt, which is due to the loss of confidence and trust in Him. Sin hinders the fellowship of the soul with GOD; and the consciousness of guilt results in complete separation; and this sin is not only one's own, but also the sin which comes from one's being involved in the universal kingdom of sin, in the common guilt of which all are partakers. It is here that the doctrine of justification becomes effective, assuring us of forgiveness, reconciliation, and adoption. Justification, however, does not imply the actual removal of guilt, but the removal of the sense of separation which the consciousness of guilt produces. "The removal of guilt and of guilt-consciousness would be in contradiction to the rule of truth for

[1] "Justification and Reconciliation," p. 349.

GOD, as also for the conscience of the sinner. The gospel of forgiveness of sins does not remove the feeling of guilt for past sins, but only the effect of this in separation from GOD, or the distrust of GOD inherent in it."[1] Justification or reconciliation is the will of GOD, as FATHER, to admit sinners, notwithstanding their sins and their consciousness of guilt, to that fellowship with Himself which includes the right of sonship and eternal life.[2]

Ritschl's weak conception of sin as pardonable ignorance is due to his weak conception of GOD, Whom he acknowledges to be a Spiritual Person, but not as Universal FATHER, and Whom he defines as Love, Almighty and Eternal. But love in this system has a peculiar sense, doubtless owing to the writer's hatred of mysticism. It can only be expressed in terms of will and purpose. And as love is directed to the furtherance of the recognised or surmised purposes of another, it is GOD'S will making the world end—which must have been originally appointed by GOD Himself—His end—an end which is realised in the kingdom of GOD. The world's end is the world's end simply because it is GOD'S. Doubtless, in subordinating His own purposes to those of this kingdom, Ritschl considered that GOD "determined Himself as Love." But he will not have us think of GOD otherwise than "in conscious relation to the end, which He Himself is.[3] And so we are compelled to conceive GOD in this system, as exhausted in His own activities.[4]

With regard to the Divine character, he writes that "as GOD is real only in the form of will, it is bad metaphysics to ascribe to Him righteousness as a quiescent attribute which belongs to Him apart from the form of will."[5] GOD'S Righteousness is accordingly his con-

[1] "Justification and Reconciliation," iii. 513.
[2] *Ibid.*, iii. 114. [3] *Ibid.*, iii. 262.
[4] See Garvie, "Ritschlian Theology," p. 62.
[5] "Justification and Reconciliation," iii. 237.

sistency in the carrying out of His purposes. This is no ethical concept.

With regard to the Divine wrath, he endeavours to give it an eschatological reference where it occurs in the New Testament. And while he admits the possibility of the wrath of GOD being revealed in the destruction of the obdurate—the existence of Whom, he declares, "lies within the scope neither of our practical judgment nor of our theoretical knowledge";[1] generally speaking, he holds that the "wrath of GOD has no religious value for Christians,"[2] but is an unfixed and formless theologoumenon. Punitive justice is contradictory of GOD's character as Love.[3] He repudiates the idea of Divine judgment and the idea of Divine retribution, an idea "that attached itself to the representation of a reciprocal relation of rights between man and GOD, which is found among the Greeks, Romans, and Israelites";[4] whereas, there is absolutely no question of any rights between man and GOD.[5] And, as the holiness of God is His righteousness in activity, there is no principle in GOD which demands the punishment of sin as such; there is no wrath of GOD against sin, no objective condemnation from which the sinner needs deliverance. The only hindrance to reconciliation with GOD lies in the consciousness of guilt and the distrust of GOD to which it leads. For the removal of such, there is the revelation of the Fatherly love and forgiving grace of GOD in CHRIST, Whose death is not a satisfaction or propitiation, but "the compendious expression for the fact that CHRIST has inwardly maintained His religious unity with GOD, and this revela-

[1] "Justification and Reconciliation," iii. 363.
[2] *Ibid.*, ii. 154.
[3] Orr, "Ritschlian Theology," pp. 147-149.
[4] "Justification and Reconciliation," iii. 343.
[5] "Unterricht," p. 13.

tion principle in the whole course of His life."[1] His Passion was "a demonstration of His fidelity in His vocation and His blessed fellowship with GOD in suffering even unto death."[2] This patience, fidelity, and stedfastness of CHRIST is the *covering* of the sinner. Under this protective covering from the majesty of GOD, the sinner's distrust in GOD is removed, his confidence is restored, and his will is brought into harmony with the will of GOD, and thus atonement is made between GOD and man. It was as finite and created—not as sinful—that the creature man required such a protective covering for "his creaturelessness." And this atonement is declared to be solely subjective, being an inner change in the heart. Ritschl repudiated all connection of atonement and propitiation with the Hebrew *kipper*, because it is connected with removal of physical uncleanness, and is predicated of the burnt and peace offering, in which there is no thought of sin, as well as of the sin and guilt offering, with which forgiveness is connected; and in consequence of this view, he held that sacrifice had nothing to do with guilt,[3] but was designed to disarm fear and to enable the creature to draw nigh to GOD.[4] On the other hand, Canon Driver argues that the fact that *kipper* is used with reference to the removal of physical uncleanness proves, not that it stands in no relation to sin, but that the Hebrews understood the term "sin" in a wider sense than we do, and included in it material as well as moral defilement.[5]

The fundamental subjectivism of the Ritschlian system shown in the basing of religious truths upon judgments of

[1] "Justification and Reconciliation," iii. 511.
[2] *Ibid.*, iii. 10.
[3] "The protective covering of the offerers from the face of GOD includes in general no reference to the sins of the same, but has respect only to the fact that they are perishable men" ("Justification and Reconciliation," ii. 204).
[4] *Ibid.*, ii. 195.
[5] Hastings, D. B. *Sub voce* Propitiation.

value as contradistinguished from judgments of existence removes all objectivity from the idea of sin, and substitutes for the objective condemnation of sin a subjective consciousness of guilt.[1] One may ask what has become of this guilt consciousness which is not removed by the gospel of forgiveness, and yet has vanished when the consciousness of reconciliation is attained. Was it an illusion from the first, designed to make us feel our separation from GOD, and then disappearing when it had done its work in making us feel that separation? The same principle of subjectivism led to the treatment of the Godhead of CHRIST as a matter of subjective value, and not as a transcendental reality. And thus an inadequate conception of sin leads to an inadequate conception of the Saviour Who, indeed, reveals GOD'S nature, realises His purposes, exhibits "a solidaric unity with GOD," and is faithful to His vocation, the realisation of the kingdom of GOD;[2] and Who, in His earthly historic life, has the value of a GOD for us, but with Whom there is now no possibility of communion, for "as exalted, He is hidden from our sight."[3]

It seems well that Ritschl, at the very outset of his system, divorces reason from religion, for it is questionable if this view of sin and its Saviour will satisfy the reason of that Christianity whose consciousness he professed to make his starting-point.

On the other hand, modern thought has received more valuable contributions to this subject from Professor Otto Pfleiderer[4] and Dr. F. R. Tennant,[5] who started from empirical scientific observation, and advanced

[1] See Orr's "Ritschlian Theology," p. 243.
[2] "Justification and Reconciliation," iii. 426.
[3] *Ibid.*, iii. 381.
[4] "Philosophy of Religion."
[5] "The Origin and Propagation of Sin," Hulsean Lectures, 1901-1902.

gradually to religious and philosophical explanation. As we read the former's "Philosophy of Religion" and the latter's "Origin and Propagation of Sin," we feel we are moving in a more instructive and real sphere, and one more congenial to the modern mind, which suspects abstract reasoning. For experience is, after all, the supreme test by which every philosophical system must be judged.

Dr. Pfleiderer finds the source of evil in the course of the development of the finite will as it struggles for independence. "The psychological genesis of evil," he says, "is not difficult to understand, if we set out from the fact that the tendency towards the satisfaction of his natural impulses is as necessary to man as it is to every other living being. This tendency, which lies in the essence of the will, or, indeed, is that essence, is not in itself evil."[1] But then, external checks from parents and society represent an opposing will, and by a series of experiences, of which punishment is one, create the impression of a power that can enforce its will. Feelings of sympathy, regard, and piety also serve to suggest "a new and more ideal motive" for obedience. And, lastly, comes the perception of the rightness of the commands; and so there gradually arises the recognition of the moral ought of the will, which gives the law and the obligation resting on man to subordinate his self-will to its prohibition . . . in short, the moral consciousness of the *shall*. According to this view, morality is not immediately given in the mind or developed from the first; seeing that the moral consciousness is the complex result of various processes of consciousness. Theologians—and Dr. Pfleiderer is a theologian himself—who assume that it is immediately given are recommended to pay more attention to the elementary facts of psychology if they

[1] "Philosophy of Religion," iv. 34-38.

would avoid the reproach of "an unethical way of thinking."

In the satisfaction of natural tendencies there is nothing evil at first, but when the existence of the moral law is recognised, it calls forth the opposition of the self-will, and as the moral consciousness awakens by degrees the man feels a rooted antipathy to the law, the goodness and authority of which he cannot but recognise—"the *ego* finds in itself a powerful inclination of self-will to lawlessness—*i.e.*, an evil inclination."[1] It is only after this psychological moment, when the consciousness of a "should" has arisen, that imputation and guilt are possible. The transition from the pre-moral stage to the morally conscious is too gradual to allow the first actual sin to be detected, but there is imputation at each particular stage in the development of conscience in exact proportion to the possibility of overcoming these lawless inclinations with the help of moral insight and impulse. Every step in the development of conscience augments this possibility, and thus increases, with man's moral freedom, his responsibility for what he does and leaves undone.[2]

These are the main lines on which an evolutionary account of the historical origin of sin in the individual is to be constructed as opposed to theories which postulate a pre-natal sin, or a timeless or noumenal decision, or a historic fall from goodness, involving the whole race, not only in evil consequences, but also in condemnation.

Dr. Pfleiderer's position with regard to original sin is this. While he repudiates the notion that the sin of another can be imputed to us, or that an original sin can involve us in condemnation, he allows that "a certain basis of fact and truth undoubtedly underlies the assertion

[1] "Philosophy of Religion," iv. 34-38.
[2] See *ibid.*, iv. 38.

of the presence in man of a natural evil or of 'original sin.'" This basis he finds in "our evil inclination." But he qualifies his statement by pointing out that the element which is natural, self-willing, cannot properly be called evil; and that which is evil in man—the tendency of will asserting itself against the law—cannot be properly called natural, as it does not belong to the naïve pre-moral stage. This system relieves GOD of the responsibility of evil. As evil only becomes actual in the lawless self-determination of the finite will, it must have its origin in the creature, not in GOD;[1] and while "evil is neither willed by GOD as an end, nor wrought by Him as His own act," it may be said that GOD permitted evil for the sake of the good which was not to be attained without this condition, "but was foreseen by GOD and ordained by Him along with the good, not as a thing that ought not to be, but as a thing that could not not-be." Evil is thus regarded as an element of the Divine world-order, but one merely accidental and to be got rid of. It is opposed to the one will or reasonable purpose of GOD, but must "fall within the sphere of that organic interaction in which the whole life of GOD unfolds itself, otherwise there would be no possibility of its being overcome by the reaction of the Divine organism of the world-order."[2]

This system is more psychologically true than those which regard sin as teleologically necessary to the best of possible worlds (Leibnitz), or an essential moment in the life of GOD (Neo-Hegelian), or a necessary stage in the development of personality (Hegel), or non-existent (Spinoza); for it treats evil as a contingent or by-product of a moral world, which is a real experience, but which is to be eventually overcome. It also finds room for an independent self-determination and selfhood of man, as opposed on one side to the materialistic tendency, which

[1] "Philosophy of Religion," iv. 38. [2] *Ibid.*, iv. 38.

would reduce man to the condition of an automaton, and, on the other, to a pantheistic system like the Hegelian, in which there is no real personality or selfhood of GOD or man. And while it is questionable if it explains (1) the supreme authority of conscience, which is inbred, not inborn, a thing of nurture, not nature, in this system; or (2) the verdict of the religious consciousness that we are in a state of revolt against GOD; or (3) the Divine Holiness of GOD, Whose attitude to man is represented as one of sympathy, or (4) the universality of evil, it does emphasise the moral difficulties of life, and its need of grace and redemption.

Dr. Tennant, in his Hulsean Lectures on the origin and propagation of sin, follows a similar line, both in his explanation of the genesis of sin and his Theodicy. Morality and responsibility are gradually developed in the race and in the individual. In the history of the race, the "tribal self" preceded the individual. Obedience to outward restraints passes into the recognition of moral sanctions. Sinfulness would be a continuance of practices conflicting with these sanctions, and would increase from zero; and the degree of guilt would be determined by "the degree in which the transgressor recognised himself to be bound thereby, the awe which he felt towards it, and the intensity of the sense of wrongdoing and shame which he was capable of feeling after its transgression."[1] Similarly, in individual development, the human infant is simply a non-moral animal. The propensities of our animal nature are "neutral" in character, material waiting to be moralised; servants to be controlled, not evils to be rooted out. The will and moral sense are made, not born. With their dawn morality first becomes a possibility. The moral idea is given by social environment, for "the race's most important gift to the individual

[1] "The Origin and Propagation of Sin," p. 93.

is the morality it has toilsomely and gradually won."[1] "And so there grows up for him a moral ideal, which is taken over into himself, an idea of goodness or right conduct which is perfectly concrete, embodied at first in a person, and afterwards in GOD. And it is continually revised and expanded through life."[2] "The task before the new-born moral agent" is that of "moralising his own nature."[3] Here is to be found the source or occasion of universal sinfulness. It is the general failure to effect on all occasions the moralisation of inevitable impulses, and to choose the end of higher worth rather than that which, of lower value, appeals with the more clamorous intensity."[4] The way from nature to character is exceedingly laborious. The stupendous task before the man is by no means minimised, even in the initial stages of his moral life. Sin is neither excused nor explained away by this system, which sees in it something empirically inevitable, although it by no means implies its theoretical or absolute necessity; and emphasises "man's crying need for grace and his capacity for a gospel of Redemption."[5]

Dr. Tennant's system presupposes a radical rift in human experience, distinguishing a period in which sin is not yet, although actions are done which are afterwards judged to be such, from a period in which sin is, and is recognised as such. He writes:[6] "Sin only emerges when the moral faculty has begun to pass upon our thoughts and actions a moral condemnation. The individual thus discovers himself to be sinful. He does not rightly find himself to have been sinful in the past, in which he knew no law, or to have been subject from birth to an indwelling power of sin." The weakness of this view is "that it assumes that the moment the will appears it adopts a neutral attitude to the natural propensities.[7]

[1] "The Origin and Propagation of Sin," p. 107
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 108. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 109. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 110.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 113. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 118. [7] *Ibid.*, Preface, xvii.

He regards the hypothesis of a "bias" as purely gratuitous. But either the natural ancestry of the race and the pre-moral life of the individual affect us, or they do not. If they do, then they weaken the individual responsibility of a conscious sin; if they do not, the universality of sin remains unexplained.

It is very far from Dr. Tennant's desire to weaken the sense of sin. He declares that his critics have confused what is commonly called "sin" with what is rightly called "sin," which he defines as a "transgression of law by a moral agent,"[1] and as "an activity of the will expressed in thought, word, or deed, contrary to the individual's conscience, to his notion of what is good or right, his knowledge of the moral law or the will of GOD."[2] It is only in this sense that sin is correlative with guilt.

The relative independence accorded to man in this system excludes the responsibility of GOD for sin. "Responsibility for the *possibility* of moral evil and for the opportunities for its realisation lies indeed with GOD," but "responsibility for the actuality of evil lies with man."[3] The self-limitation of GOD is not only necessary to emphasise the existence of evil, but also of the free will of man. Our freedom, as Dr. Martineau said, "is included in what GOD *has caused*, though excluded from what He *is causing*." The question, "why the actualisation of evil was permitted, and not prevented, by a Being at once Aimighty and All-holy," he says, is "identical with the question whether the holiness and love of a self-revealing GOD are better manifested in an entirely non-moral world or in one in which good is possible, though mixed with evil, and in which good may yet be the final goal of ill."[4] He rightly says that "We

[1] "The Origin and Propagation of Sin," Preface, xxv.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 163. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 122. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 139.

have no right to deny that the present world, with all its sin and misery, is compatible with the love of a righteous GOD, and that the establishment of the possibility of sin is perfectly compatible with what we mean by optimism";[1] and he looks forward to its being "ultimately transcended and overcome." This possibility rests in the fact that it is the human will that is at fault.

Neither of these empirical theories gives sufficient grounds for the validity or authority of the moral intuition,[2] nor for the origin of the Christian consciousness of sin. Is there any possibility of reconciling the positions of Christianity and scientific observation? Not if we assume, as Professor Orr does in "God's Image in Man," that "on the basis of current anthropological theories we can never have anything but defective and inadequate views of sin." But there is a possibility if we approach the subject without prejudice, and hesitate to commit ourselves to any theory of sin which is incompatible with the results of psychological and ethical analysis.

It is a mistake to think that men must set themselves against the Divine revelation given to them if they try to discover the gradual and various methods in which man became sensible of GOD'S existence, Holiness and Truth. We cannot all be content with the method of Ritschl, who kept reason and faith wide apart. If religion is to surpass reason, it must first pass its test. The soul has reasons the mind knows nothing of; but as the same indwelling SPIRIT is the source of the laws and ideas of mind, as well as of the aspirations and instincts of the soul, the latter are simply the former produced to infinity,

[1] "The Origin and Propagation of Sin," p. 140.

[2] Dr. Tennant, however, aptly quotes H. Sidgwick, "Methods of Ethics," fifth edition, p. 213: "Those who dispute the validity of moral or other intuitions on the ground of their derivation must be required to show, not merely that they are the effects of certain causes, but that these causes are of a kind that tend to produce invalid beliefs."

otherwise they are illusory and useless. There can be no real cleft between the mental and moral life, between the conclusions of the one and the convictions of the other, if there is to be any coherence or synthetic unity in personality.

What view of sin is at once compatible with scientific experience and Christian consciousness? This is the real question. In answering it, we must remember that sin is altogether subjective, and we must start from the personal sense of sin, not from any objective standard. Sin is relative to the sense of sin, which is not the measure of it, for the sense is often in inverse proportion to the fact.[1] But this sense is due to the feeling of inner discord between what one is and what one ought to be; a sense which has various degrees, from comparative indifference to complete unrest, corresponding to various degrees of moral development; a sense which can only emerge with the dawning of a moral ideal. This new experience has not only a moral, but a religious aspect, for the consciousness of the moral ideal leads to the consciousness of GOD. Failure to attain the moral ideal is felt to be separation from GOD, which causes disquiet until some method of atonement brings peace. The more mechanical this atonement is, the less will be its influence on the moral sense, lowering and blunting its activity, or substituting for it a false religious sense. This sense of sin, so far as it leads to improvement and reform, is useful to the race.

Does not this explanation of the sense of sin correspond with the teaching of our LORD concerning the HOLY SPIRIT, Who shall convince the world of sin because they believe not Him, because they have not lived up to the moral ideal He has given them, but have rejected it?

But, on the other hand, it is urged that this sense of

[1] Dr. Orchard's "Modern Theories of Sin," p. 117.

sin is the proof of guilt. This leads us to the examination of what constitutes guilt. The degree of guilt is in exact proportion to the degree of freedom and knowledge, or inner light. Conditions that reduce either of these elements reduce the responsibility, and consequently the guilt. Accordingly, a man is not guilty for the nature with which he began life, a matter equally beyond his choice and knowledge. He is in no way responsible for the sins of his parents, much less for the sin of the race which affects his life. If a man deliberately chooses evil, knowing it to be evil, he either chooses it because it is evil—a Satanic and abnormal condition, to be treated as irresponsible[1]—or in spite of its being evil, which implies a weakness of restraining will, for which he may not be responsible. Guilt, accordingly, depends on so many conditions that it is impossible to gauge it, and a protest must be made against the loose theological use of the term.

But it is in connection with the idea of punishment—both liability to and dread of punishment—that the word *guilt* (which originally meant payment) has had most disastrous influence on religious thought. For in the desire to evade such punishment men have invented the theory of a Substitute Who bore it for them, and took their guilt upon Himself.[2]

But sense of sin is by no means witness of guilt, for it is found strongest among the least guilty. It is developed according as the moral ideal grows in the soul. It is the holiest saints who feel their sins most keenly, not because they dread punishment, not because they long to evade the just consequences of their deeds, but because they are

[1] See Max Nordau on Satanism, in his book on "Degeneration."

[2] In Isa. liii. the suffering servant is an *Asham*, a guilt-offering which implied compensation.

sensible of a higher and better standard than the highest and best to which they have attained; and they are filled with pain and shame because of their failure, their missing-of-the-mark, their *ἁμαρτία*. Is not this the convincing work of the Divine SPIRIT? The sense of sin, which becomes more intense the higher our manhood grows,[1] is accordingly a proof of forgivableness, a harbinger of life, a promise of reconciliation. It is a suffering for sin—not the suffering of a penalty attached to sin as an offence, but the suffering the sin itself, which leads to its annihilation. The former idea has led to unreal and forensic views of atonement, which are rejected by the moral sense, and do not touch either the human character or its sin. The latter leads to the real and spiritual theory of an atonement which is consummated, not only in a union of the separated, but in the conquest and destruction of that which separated—the evil habit of the human will.

Sooner or later all men must have this sense of sin if they are to be saved from their sin; for they must recognise it as that which separates from felicity, truth, and GOD. There is no better means of creating it than the Gospel of CHRIST—His character, life, death, and revelation. And as experience proves that there is no greater stimulus to moral endeavour and self-sacrificing life than this sense of sin, which grows more intense as the moral ideal becomes more and more identified with the holiness of a personal GOD—ever-living, ever-loving, all-mighty, and all-good—it is ethically justified, psychologically explained.

It is this sense of sin also that leads to the solution of the moral antinomy between the sense of individual responsibility and the universality of sin. When a man

[1] Sir Oliver Lodge confirms this statement, writing: "As we rise in the scale our ideals rise too, so that there is a constant sense of imperfection" ("Man and the Universe," p. 244).

is conscious of his own sinful state, he becomes also conscious that all men in whom he observes similar failings are sinners, and by a process of induction he arrives at the conclusion that all men are sinners. It was the Apostle St. Paul's consciousness of his own state that led him to the conclusion that "all sinned"; and it was the high moral ideal revealed in the life, teaching, and death of CHRIST that filled his soul both with a sense of failure and dissatisfaction and with an ineffable yearning after righteousness. It is the memory of that Perfect Life, to whose high levels we have not attained, but towards which our highest and truest aspirations are directed—not the memory of a perfect human life in an early paradise which we were not able to retain, and whose loss involved us in most disastrous consequences, physically, morally, and spiritually—that has been and is the principal factor in the progress of the life of the Christian Church. The former, proclaiming the strength of goodness, fills us with hope; the latter, testifying to the force of evil, would reduce us to despair. The former is psychologically true; the latter is anthropologically false. The latter has reduced the Gospel to a scheme of escape from punishment; the former view has raised it to the programme for the highest, holiest, and happiest life—union with the CHRIST in the kingdom of GOD; co-operation with the CHRIST in the purposes of GOD.

GOD has created man free to choose his own path, but He has also created man for Himself. And, consequently, man can have no rest until he freely and spontaneously seeks rest in GOD.

> "What is that I hunger for but GOD?
> My GOD! my GOD! let me for once look on Thee,
> As though naught else existed—we alone."

It is the GOD-hunger in the heart of man that makes man dissatisfied with himself—his ideals, his life, his

thoughts, words, and deeds—that induces in his soul the longing for union and communion with the Everlasting FATHER, a desire for His kingdom and its righteousness, and a hatred for all that makes for selfishness, impurity, and unholiness. And it is the Spirit of CHRIST that creates that hunger and thirst after righteousness, as it is His holy presence that creates the sense of sin.[1]

This theory does not minimise sin because it gives intensity to the sense of sin; and yet it regards sin as something that must gradually disappear as the Divine purpose is slowly developed in human life. Then the sense of sin, which has spurred us on to GOD through a world of trial, trouble, and tribulation, will be exalted into that sense of GOD which was our Master's glory in His life and His comfort in His Cross and Passion, and which has created in humanity the sense of sin.[2]

The Gospel of CHRIST is, accordingly, the only philosophical system qualified to further the great ends of humanity; to throw light upon the dark enigmas of evil and sin, and lead human thought to Him, the GOD-Man, in Whom we see Divinity in its humility and manhood at its height—GOD coming down to man, man reaching up to GOD. "Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world." "The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in Me."

To treat the subject from a practical point of view. Sin constitutes the problem of our day. It is a universal experience. There was never a time, perhaps, when there

[1] "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O LORD" (Luke v. 8); "I am the Light of the world" (John viii. 12).

[2] Compare how Dr. Moberly explained penitence "as almost another word for spiritual consciousness" ("Atonement and Personality," p. 44). Schleiermacher makes the consciousness of sin dependent on a consciousness of GOD. See "Der Christliche Glaube": "We have the consciousness of sin, as often as accompanying a frame of mind, a GOD-consciousness determines our own self-consciousness as *unlust*" (S. 66).

were more serious attempts to explain and remove evil and vice, and to redeem mankind from their influence; there was never a time when there were sterner denunciations of the sins of society, or fiercer and more public indictments of national crimes. The general standard of ethical conduct cannot be described as low when humanity to man and beast was never so extensively encouraged; when every device is sought for the minimising of pain and the reduction of poverty and distress; when children are treated with uniform tenderness and the helpless with compassion.

The revelations of the public press and the Divorce Courts, and the scandals of the White Slave Traffic and the Congo, prove that the age is not as pure and humane as it might and ought to be; but it is none the less genial and kindly disposed, and, though not avowedly religious, eager to take part in every work for the amelioration of human life and its conditions. Behind its every endeavour is the inspiration of Christianity. Even though modern philanthropy proclaim its divorce from religion, it cannot separate itself from Christianity, for when it is traced to its deepest springs one finds that the moral teaching and ideals of CHRIST are its sources.

There are many who hold, or affect to hold, that life is on the down-grade; that the golden age has vanished before the inroad of sin and cruelty; that there will be a final and universal triumph of evil. The sense of society may be titillated with the poisonous perfume of the pessimism of the "Rubáiyát,"[1] but it is not permeated by it; for there is always the virile optimism of Tennyson and Browning to act as an antiseptic in stirring the

[1] *Cf.* Omar Khayyám, *e.g.*:

"The worldly hope men set their hearts upon
Turns ashes, or it prospers, and anon,
Like snow upon the desert's dusky face,
Lighting a little hour or two—is gone."

hearts and kindling the enthusiasm of our people. It is the development of the moral ideal and the sense of sin that cause us frequently to bewail the moral degeneration of mankind. Kant has explained this in the same way: "The cry of the continually increasing degradation of the race arises just from this—that when one stands on a higher step of morality he sees farther before him, and his judgment on what men are as compared with what they ought to be is more strict. Our self-blame is consequently more severe the more steps in morality we have already ascended in the whole course of the world's history as known to us."[1]

In these days it is generally assumed that the evangel of modern science is that man need not trouble about his sins, and that the doctrine of modern society is that the only sin is discovery. It is no doubt true that many smart sayings have been uttered with a flippancy that is superficial. No serious or honest mind can afford to make light of sin. The words of Sir Oliver Lodge—"As a matter of fact, the higher man of to-day is not worrying about his sins at all, still less about their punishment; his mission, if he is good for anything, is to be up and doing"[2]—are quoted as if they represented the whole mind of the scientific world and of a leading physicist on the subject. In answer to a criticism of this very statement, he says: "It may surely, without unorthodoxy, be held that there are two ways of overcoming sin and sinful tendencies, though they are not mutually exclusive: one, the direct way, of concentrating attention on them with brooding and lamentation; the other, the indirect and, as I think, the safer and more efficacious and altogether more profitable way, of putting in so many hours' work per day, and of excluding weeds from the garden by

[1] Kant's "Theory of Ethics," Abbott, p. 326.
[2] "Man and the Universe," p. 240.

energetic cultivation of healthy plants."[1] This explanation might truly be based on St. Paul's words: "Work out your salvation with fear and trembling; for it is GOD Who is working in you both the will and the work for His good will."[2] Perhaps the latter portion of the text is not represented as adequately as it might be. Again, he says: "It is desirable to avoid misconception by explicitly making the admission that doubtless there is a sense in which radical imperfection can be predicated of the whole human race without exception—the sense in which the heavens can be said to be unclean, and the angels chargeable with folly; the sense in which Job, though able to rebut the charge of hidden wickedness brought by his friends, was willing abundantly to admit vileness when accosted by the Deity." Again he says, supporting what has been just said concerning the sense of sin and the moral ideal: "As we rise in the scale our ideals rise too, so that there is a constant sense of imperfection."[3] And yet again, when writing of sin, he says: "We have learnt that it is foreign to the universe, it is not the will of GOD; it is not due to his caprice, or amusement, or dictation, or predestination, or pagan example; it is something to be rid of; and there is no peace or joy to be had until unity of will is secured and past rebellions are forgiven."[4]

Neither does he deny the existence of wrath. He is sure that what may be humanly spoken of as fierce wrath against sin, and even against a certain class of sinner, is a Divine attribute; but he maintains that when we are speaking of the sin against which GOD'S anger blazes, we do not mean the sins of failure, the burden of remorse, the acts which cause contrition and penitence on the part of a saint or a child or a labouring man. "There are many grades of sin, and anyone may know the kind

[1] "Man and the Universe," p. 241.
[2] Phil. ii. 12.
[3] "Man and the Universe," p. 244.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 267.

of sin which excites the anger of GOD by bethinking him of the kind which causes his own best and most righteous anger."[1] Such sins are an abscess on the universe, and must be cured by human co-operation, just as the phagocytes of the blood co-operate with the brain in attacking the disease, for "we are the white corpuscles of the cosmos."

This is a notable contribution to the present controversy on sin, recognising its malignancy and poison, and by no means minimising our responsibility for its existence, for it calls us to co-operate with the Almighty in its destruction. We need support and confirmation from a leading representative of science when trying to deal with the most profound problem of our day—a problem, too, that bristles with difficulties. On the one hand we find moral levity, general indifference to religion, a weakening of the sense of sin through the attempts of the secularists to undermine moral sanctions as well as religious sanctities;[2] and on the other hand we have a deepened sense of sin—a feeling of its seductiveness and its sorrow, its deceitfulness and its disillusionment, its tragedy and its retribution, not only in the religious writings, but also in the literature, especially the higher drama,[3] of the day, which is pessimistic and gloomy. If we find opponents of Christianity, like Mr. Blatchford, attacking Christianity for forsaking the ideals of CHRIST,[4] we also have Nietzsche, chiefly known for his doctrine of the "superman," beyond good and evil, in "The Antichrist," condemning those very ideals, and advocating voluptuousness, thirst of

[1] "Man and the Universe," p. 252.

[2] *E.g.*, "Ethic of Freethought," xiii., xv., by Karl Pearson, and Mr. Taylor's "Problem of Conduct," pp. 206-218.

[3] Among modern playwrights of a pessimistic colour are John Galsworthy, well known for his "Justice" and "Strife"; Granville Barker, for "Waste"; Laurence Housman, for "Prunella." *Cf.* Ibsen's works.

[4] "God and My Neighbour," pp. 166, 197.

power, and selfishness—the very evils which Christianity had overthrown. We have the spirit of liberty in one sphere casting itself loose from all religious considerations and moral restraints, and in the other professedly Christian men repudiating the most sacred tradition of Christianity—the moral perfection and sinlessness of CHRIST.[1] On the one hand we find the notion of a Divine Personality disappearing before a theologian's "Deus Immanens" indwelling in the life of the developing universe and invading the will of man, and on the other hand we find even that "Deus Immanens" vanishing before "the Absolute" of Mr. Bradley, to whom nothing is either good or bad.[2] On the one hand we have students of comparative religion asserting that later and lower religious ideas prevailed over earlier and higher ones among the Aryan peoples;[3] and on the other hand we have the scientific world insisting on an Evolution instead of a Fall, and establishing an ascent of man from lower stages, and of morality from non-moral antecedents. On the one hand we have a religion which insists that sin is a hindrance to human growth and an obstacle to spiritual progress—that it is something that ought not to be; and on the other we have a philosophy which regards sin as necessary to the development of man (Hegel), or to the knowledge of good (Fiske), or as unavoidable (Ritschl). On the one hand we have necessity to explain the universality of sin and explain away its guilt, and

[1] R. J. Campbell, "Jesus or Christ," p. 191. Holtzmann, "Le bon Jesu," p. 38, holds that the idea of the sinlessness of JESUS originated with St. Paul. See also Werner, Schmiedel, etc. On the other hand, Sir Oliver Lodge maintains that He was preserved from the load of sin which follows from inadequate knowledge, imperfe insight, animal ancestry, and an alien will.

[2] "Ugliness, error, and evil are all owned by and contribute to the wealth of the Absolute" ("Appearance and Reality," p. 489).

[3] W. St. Clair Tisdall, "Comparative Religion," p. 28, etc.—*e.g.*, the deposition of Varuna (οὐρανός) by Dyaus (Ζεύς).

on the other freedom to explain its guilt and explain away its universality. On the one hand we have a self-determination which is only consistent with obedience, and on the other a determinism[1] which is fatal to responsibility. On the one hand the radical evil of human nature is traced to the human will (Kant), and on the other to the act of the creating will (Schopenhauer) or to an evil principle antagonistic to the good (Zoroaster, Manes). On the one hand we have the unconditional nature of the categorical imperative (Kant), and the absolute authority of conscience (Butler); and on the other, the repudiation of obligation (Bentham), and the derivation of conscience from fear, superstition, and custom (Schopenhauer). On the one hand we have the forgiveness of sin disregarded, and on the other hand denied. On the one hand the theologian deplores the utter depravity of human nature owing to original sin,[2] and on the other the poet sings:[3]

> "Not in entire forgetfulness,
> And not in utter nakedness,
> But trailing clouds of glory do we come
> From GOD, Who is our home."

Such are some of the positions that confront us as we try to grasp the subject in order to make it comprehensible to others. They teach us that evil can only be defined with reference to goodness and to GOD; that if it is a privation of light, it is also an assertion of self;[4]

[1] H. Spencer, "Psychology," p. 500—freedom described as an inveterate illusion. Also Maudsley: "There is a destiny made for man by his ancestors, and no one can elude, were he able to attempt it, the tyranny of his organisation" (A. Bradford's "Heredity," pp. 81 *et seq.*).

[2] Newman, "Apologia," chap. v., on this terrible original calamity; and Augustine: "Teste ipsa generis humani miseria peccatum originale monstratur" (*Op. Imp.* iii. 89).

[3] Wordsworth, "Ode on Intimations of Immortality."

[4] Dr. McTaggart (Hegel. Cosmol., pp. 150, 158) describes it as "both positive and negative . . . All sin is in one sense positive, for

that if it is "good in the making,"[1] it is also a negation of GOD. It is the will determining to be a law to itself; and yet this antagonism to law cannot, as Kant declared, be made a spring of action unless by a diabolical being—the Spirit of Satan, who would wreck the purposes of GOD, and "out of good find means of evil." Such Satanism may be a phenomenon in human life, but it is abnormal and inhuman. Sin lies in a positive choosing of the evil, not because it is evil, but in spite of its being evil. This may develop into a settled condition in which the soul is set in a wrong relation to GOD; but even though the whole world lie in wickedness, it is most decidedly not at enmity with GOD. Its opposition may be pronounced, its mind perverse, its disobedience reckless, its revolt gratuitous, but it is far from the setting up of evil as its god. The hatred of Christianity is not likely to become a recognised element, much less a permanent condition of a rational society which owes its development and every moral ideal and aspiration it possesses to Christian influence and nurture, tradition and teaching. Nor could a state of malevolence ever give satisfaction, or a condition of evil ever give rest. We believe that good will somehow be the goal of ill; that man, after many trials of his freedom and attempts at self-gratification, will be glad to find his highest freedom in obedience to GOD and his supreme satisfaction in union with GOD; for it is only good to be free when we are free to be good. But it is more logical for us who believe in moral freedom and moral guilt—the general presuppositions of the idea of reconciliation, as Ritschl described them—to look forward to such a setting right of that wrong relation, to such an overcoming of dis-

---

it is an affirmation of the sinner's nature. When I sin, I place my own will in a position of supremacy."

[1] Emerson.

obedience, to such a reconciliation of the separated, than for those who treat freedom as an "inveterate illusion," or believe in a destiny made by one's ancestors.[1] And while we must admit that there is a certain element of ignorance in the evolution of a sin—for it is after its commission that its true nature dawns upon us and we are penitent—we do not consider that sin is necessary to the development of life, seeing that our LORD was without sin;[2] and although we experience a difficulty in explaining its existence, we hold that it will be eventually overcome and transcended, seeing that it contains, in the physical discomfort and misery it inflicts, the moral dissatisfaction and unrest it causes, the seeds of its own destruction.

> "Man as yet is being made, and ere the crowning age of ages,
> Shall not, æon after æon, touch and mould him into shape."

Otherwise we would find it hard to reconcile the permissibility of evil with the goodness and omnipotence of GOD. And even if we adopt the theory of evolution, which treats sin not as a fall from a stage of perfection, but a failure to rise to a higher stage of existence, it is still an imperfection for which man is to some degree responsible. And in the consummation of the age we can believe that such will be finally and completely removed by the LORD and Giver of Life, immanent in man and the universe, and to be identified with neither.

And we believe in the forgiveness of sins; for the sense of sin, which becomes more intense and clear under the moral light of the Spirit of CHRIST, is a proof (1) that GOD Himself, in making us feel the separation of sin, is

[1] H. Spencer, "Psychology," i., pp. 500 *et seq.*, and Mr. Maudsley (see Bradford's "Heredity," pp. 81 *et seq.*).

[2] Dr. Forrest writes in "The Authority of Christ": "As sin by its very definition is the thing which ought not to be, if we affirm a single disobedience to be indispensable to the knowledge or service of GOD, we land ourselves in the paradox that that which ought not to be is yet, in some degree, needful and unavoidable."

removing that which separates; (2) that in making us aware of the thwarting of His purposes by sin, He is fulfilling them in us; (3) that in making us experience the misery of a state of imperfection, He is perfecting us unto the perfect day; (4) that in making us dread the pollution of sin, He is cleansing us from all sin; and (5) that in making us ashamed of the perversion and enslavement of our wills, He is working in us a change of heart and mind, and preparing us for the glorious liberty of the children of GOD.

What room for atonement is here? There is room for an atonement, not as a forensic, legal, and external transaction, but as a Divine grace of repentance, a spiritual force for a new life, presented to us objectively by the Divine SPIRIT in the Life and Death of the Crucified; appropriated by us subjectively through the same SPIRIT as our lives are hid with CHRIST in GOD.[1]

[1] "There is an immense *a priori* argument for the truth of some atonement—past, present, or future — some way of realising and feeling that we are at one with GOD; for the need, all but universally felt in human nature, of some way of approaching GOD. There is the universal sense of dependence, the *universal consciousness* of the ideal nature in us, the disparity between our ideals and our attainments—the sense of sin" (Archdeacon Watson, "Hulsean Lectures," p. 26).

CHAPTER II

LEADING PRINCIPLES FOR A THEORY

THIS is no attempt to reconstruct the doctrine of the Atonement on new lines; but it is an effort to indicate the leading principles of a theory which may be based on Scripture and yet true to philosophy.

In the first place, it must be pointed out that, if we would combine the various aspects of the Atonement in one intelligible view, we must not only avoid certain misconceptions which are founded on unnatural and illogical abstractions, but we must also shun the dogmatic method. It is a false abstraction to consider the Atoning Death of CHRIST apart from His Incarnate Life, which was in itself an At-one-ment of GOD and man; it is a false abstraction to consider only the subjective aspect of the Atonement—its moral influence—and to disregard the mysterious sacrifice of the Death of CHRIST. And to regard the SON as placating the FATHER by such a sacrifice, in the dogmatic acceptation of the term, is to create an unnatural schism in that GODHEAD, the unity of which in love and purpose was manifested in that Atonement, which St. Paul sums up in the pithy sentence: "GOD *was* in CHRIST reconciling the world unto Himself." The dogmatic view of the Atonement itself, as a legal or even as a spiritual transaction external to humanity, is not only false exegesis, but false philosophy. On the other hand, the view of the Atonement as a

unifying, spiritualising process, set up *in* human life by the Spirit of the SON, Who by His Incarnation in humanity prepared that humanity for the fuller indwelling of the Spirit of Divine love and holiness, the endowment of a larger life, so that it might become the "temple of GOD," "the Body of CHRIST," is not only more elevating to human nature, but is also more true to the mysticism of such expressions as "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life," "life hid with CHRIST in GOD," "CHRIST Who is our life," "a new creature in CHRIST,"[1] for which transactional theories find no place; and is also more agreeable to philosophy, which recognises *processes* natural, ethical, logical, intellectual, and spiritual, but is opposed to such theological "leaps" as a transferred morality or a substituted righteousness.

The first point of importance that requires consideration, if not settlement, in any doctrine of Atonement is the relation of the Atonement to the Incarnation. Is the Atonement, the primary motive and *sine qua non* of the Incarnation, the great necessity out of which it arose? Or is the Atonement a development of the Incarnation? Or is the Incarnation itself the Atonement—the At-one-ment between GOD and man, effected and realised in the Person of the GOD-Man? Might not the Incarnation be expressed in terms of the Atonement, in the words of Irenæus: "The Word of GOD, on account of His great love, became what we are to make us what He is"?[2] If so, would not the whole life of the Incarnate Word be an Atonement just as much as His death?

Personality is again the key to the solution of this problem. It would surely create a division in the Divine Personality of CHRIST if we separated the Atonement

[1] John xiv. 6; Col. iii. 3, 4; 2 Cor. v. 17; ἦν—καταλλάσσων, 2 Cor. v. 19.

[2] "Adv. Hær.," v., praef.

even in thought, from His Incarnation, of which it was a development and culmination, just as we may not think of it apart from His Resurrection, Ascension, and mediatorial kingdom. His total Personality was identified with His work. To consider the Atonement apart from the Incarnation were, accordingly, to be guilty of one of the false abstractions with which theological thought has to contend. It is the Incarnation, which revealed His organic union with our race, that gives His Atonement the value it possesses. Had not the Word become flesh, there had been no Lamb of GOD to take away the sin of the world. Anything less than Divine sympathy were imperfect; anything less than Divine goodness were incapable of complete suffering with sin and for sin. The whole Life—earthly Life—of the SON of man was an Atonement, a redemption and reconstruction of a disorganised humanity. Nay, we can go farther back, and see in "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world"[1] the eternal attitude of the GOD of Holiness to sin, the eternal and universal relation of the GOD of Love to man—an eternal principle expressed in a temporal actuality. "GOD was in CHRIST reconciling the world unto Himself."

Conceive the ineffable sacrifice of the Word, Who was born as babe, and Whose divine nature became quiescent during His human infancy, while His human mind and soul developed! In this deep humiliation of the Son of man we see the inward quality and character of a Divine self-sacrifice. To some it must seem a far greater sacrifice in a Divine Being to permit His Divine Power to be suspended for a human lifetime, than to allow a human organism in which He had tabernacled for a brief period to be destroyed by an act which enabled Him to resume His Divine Power and Office. As the efficacy of

[1] Rev. xiii. 8.

the Atonement is not to be restricted to the actual blood-shedding, neither is the work of the Atonement to be confined to the Crucifixion. It is the CHRIST Who bore the Cross, rather than the Cross which bore the CHRIST, that is the true focus of modern thought.

Regarding the Cross as a development of the Incarnation, we have an insight into the nature and importance of the sufferings of GOD—the unique work He wrought for man. Not that we regard His Divinity as enabling Him to endure infinite penal suffering (older Calvinists), or as giving infinite value to any penal suffering (later Calvinists), but as imparting infinite importance and value to His death, not only as a Divine testimony against the principle of evil, but as a Divine triumph over it, which gave a new lease of spiritual hope and life to the race of men. It was as if the forces of evil were gathered together in one grand assault upon the holiness and righteousness of one Man, and were defeated because that one Man was not only the Representative of man, but also the Representative of GOD. It was the connection between what He is Who makes the Atonement and the Atonement which He makes that is the secret of His Passion. We cannot subordinate such a Redemption to the Incarnation. It was the work of the Incarnate Life in its relation to sin and evil and sorrow. "By Himself"—that is, by what He was and is and shall be—"He purged our sins."[1]

On the other hand, we who live in a world of sin and sorrow cannot contemplate an Incarnation without an Atonement, or a Saviour Who did not save, or a Master Who did not bear the brunt of the attack in His own soul; Who did not sustain the burden of suffering and sorrow on Himself in such a way that we might find it lighter.

[1] Heb. i. 3.

In the Middle Ages, Duns Scotus and Thomas Aquinas were divided on this subject. The former held that the Divine Incarnation would have taken place even if sin had not entered the world, having been foreseen by GOD, "not as an incident, but as the ultimate end," contemplated by Him from all eternity; so that in an unfallen world GOD would still have become incarnate and so the Head of humanity, and would have offered up sacrifices eucharistic, not propitiatory. But in the case of the Son of Man representing sinners, His obedience to the Divine Will took the form of expiation, and what would have been a thanksgiving to Almighty GOD became a satisfaction of the All-just. But Thomas regarded the Incarnation only as an expedient by which the end might be more fittingly attained[1] (*per quod melius et convenientius pervenitur ad finem*), and limits the purpose of the Incarnation to the taking away of sin, holding that if Adam had not sinned, there had been no Incarnation.

Viva,[2] a Scotist, on the other hand, states that "the Word would have become incarnate even had Adam not sinned, and that the motive of the Incarnation was not only the redemption, but more especially the exaltation, of human nature."

The teaching of Athanasius seems to be a combination of both views. "Our cause," he wrote, "was the occasion of His descent, and our transgression called forth the Word's love of man. Of His Incarnation we became the ground."[3] GOD could have undone the curse of sin by His Word; but then man, restored to his pristine condition, would have received grace only *ab extra*, and would not have had it united to his body, and he had been led away again and again,[4] and, owing to the *corruption* that

[1] "Summa Theologica," P. iii., Qn. 1., Art. 2.

[2] Newman (ii., 187, Athanasius), quoting from "Curs. Theol. de Incarn.," p. 74.

[3] "De Incarn." v.

[4] "Orat.," ii. 68.

ensued, repentance was not sufficient.[1] According to Athanasius, therefore, our LORD "became incarnate that He might die for us and that He might renew us."

At the same time, it was not the "necessity" so much as the "fitness" of that Death that was discussed by the Fathers.[2] And it is to be remembered that the Alexandrian theologians saw in the Incarnation the organic union of man in CHRIST—the representative Man, Who, in taking our humanity up to GOD, encountered and removed the opposition offered in it by self and sin to the Divine love and purpose.

There is a tendency in our day, among writers of the Westcott School, to return to a position something similar to that of the Scotists, and to regard the Incarnation as the basis of the Atonement, and to treat the Atonement as the episode, or even as the tragedy, of the Incarnation, but subordinate to it; so that what would have been the highest form of glory in an unfallen world was surpassed through the agony of death and by reason of evil in a world of suffering and sin. The glory of GOD is thus strangely, marvellously enhanced by sin and its atonement.[3]

According to this view, the Atonement would be the completion and fulfilment of the hopes and promises of the Incarnation, and GOD would be brought into intimate

[1] "De Incarn.," vii.

[2] *E.g.*, Ath., "De Incarn.," c. xx.; Gregory of Nyssa, "Orat. Catech.," 22: "Non ergo fuit necessarium Christum pati necessitate coactionis." Thomas Aquinas, "S. T.," iii. 46. 1; Newman, ii. 187. Ath., "De Incarn.," vi.: "It would not be seemly (ἀπρεπές δὲ ἦν) that what GOD made capable of blessing and actually sharing the Logos should perish. It would be a thing unworthy of GOD'S goodness."

[3] This view also throws light on the permission of sin. Why was sin permitted? Professor Orr answers: "The ultimate solution lies, we must believe, where Christianity places it, in the larger results in glory to GOD and good to man—the nobler virtue attained through conflict and temptation, the loftier holiness and higher reward of those who overcome, the diviner blessedness of sonship in CHRIST—that accrue from its permission" (*Expositor*, vii. 59, 403).

relationship with man, so as to become identified with his nature and his state. Dr. A. B. Davidson considers that this view "involves a kind of principle according to which GOD develops Himself by an inward necessity."[1] We would rather say that it implies a progressive development of the love of GOD for humanity, of His work in humanity, and of His revelation to humanity.

There seems to be no dividing line between the Incarnation and the Atonement if we regard the promise of the Incarnation as contained in the nature of things, and if we consider that in the shadow of sin lay the potentiality of the Atonement. A cause of misunderstanding is the treating of the Incarnation as dependent on the Fall. As Bishop Westcott taught, the Incarnation was inherently involved in the Creation. The Incarnation itself implies rather a realisation of undeveloped but inherent possibilities than a restoration of something lost. But no doubt the form of the Incarnation was modified by the past failures and sins of man, which entailed suffering and shame for the Incarnate One. The purpose of GOD for His Creation was not set aside by sin, but was carried out under conditions which did not make for the righteousness He represented. The keynote of the Incarnation is, therefore, not what man had become, but what he was capable of becoming as a "man in CHRIST."

In such a world as this, faith in an Incarnation of necessity implies faith in an Atonement. For while GOD'S love for man explains Creation, Incarnation, and the ultimate participation of man in the Divine Nature, in a world that called for redemption from sin, an Incarnate One Who did not come "to seek and save that which was lost" were inferior to One Who did redeem. But the faith of the Atonement was historically based upon the faith of the Incarnation. Forgiveness of sins

[1] "Old Testament Prophecy," c. x.

through faith in His Name was only preached after the HOLY SPIRIT had taught man the Divine reality of His personality and His resurrection from the dead. And so the faith of the Atonement presupposes the faith of the Incarnation. In such a world as this the Incarnation would therefore develop naturally and logically as Atonement—a making peace between GOD and man, a removing the differences between men, and a bringing to realisation the original ideas of GOD. This view need not lead to what is common enough in our days—the laying of all the stress upon the moral worth and sublime example of the Passion—for it emphasises the fact that the Divine Word of GOD was at work in His own Creation, removing and reforming, and restoring the Divine image and holiness, and so counteracting the evil that opposed His Divine purpose, and overcoming it.

And regarding the Incarnation as the grand central act of GOD, the supreme manifestation of His love and holiness, which reveals His wonderful purpose for man—the attainment of the likeness of GOD, the realisation of his sonship in GOD—sin assumes a teleological character; it becomes the obstruction of the Divine will, prevents the realisation of the Divine purpose, and has to be overcome that such may not be frustrated. This is certainly a grander view than the theory that the Incarnation was necessary only to make good an Atonement. For the creation of man itself implied in some ways an Incarnation, Bishop Westcott finding in Gen. i. 27, "And GOD created man in His own image, in the image of GOD created He him," the Gospel of an Incarnation.[1] "*Homo particeps Dei* (man made partaker of GOD) is the satisfaction—the only possible satisfaction—of *homo capax Dei* (man capable of receiving GOD)." "The fitness and

[1] "Christus Consummator," pp. 104 *et seq.*

necessity of the Incarnation exist, therefore, from the moment when man was made."

There are certain tendencies of modern thought, scientific and philosophical, which fall more into line with the view of the Atonement as a development of Incarnation than with the popular and dogmatic form of that doctrine. There is the theory of evolution, which, followed to its ultimate conclusion, unifies life to such an extent that there seems to be no break in the continuity of the kingdom of life from a single cell to a full-grown man, the lord of a thousand trillion cells; so that the universe appears to be one vast living body, or, rather, a gigantic community of living entities interrelated and derived from one source. If the same principle be extended to the spiritual life of man, and its present capacity derived from very modest beginnings in the hoary past of the race—as is being done by many—there would be little room for a doctrine of sin or Atonement in the dogmatic acceptation of the terms. The existence of an evolving soul, manifesting itself in a material vehicle, might, indeed, be conceived; but moral evil would be identified rather with the present stage of imperfection, or with the failure to rise higher in the scale of life, than with a deliberate transgression: I do not say a fall from a stage of perfection, for such a stage has never been reached on this planet save in one example—the Perfect Man. Failure to rise or to raise one's environment might still, however, be conceived as an *ἀνομία*, or breach of the law of evolution; but the probability is that, unless there were a belief in a supreme personal consciousness to which man could feel responsible, it would not be regarded as anything more than an anachronism, or the sin of being out of date.

Secondly, the prevailing belief in the universal and uniform order of law and life admits no place for any

special intervention or interference such as the dogmatic theory of Atonement requires. And yet in one sense that universal and uniform order has been broken by the sin which may, as we have seen, be regarded as the *ἀνομία* in the cosmos—the real violation of the universal order, a miracle in the more objectionable sense of the term;[1] so that that which would restore the broken order would seem more natural and less miraculous.

And, thirdly, the Hegelian idealism which treats sin as a thing that *can not be* rather than a thing which *ought not to be*, as something to be transcended but not to be repented of, regards deliberate and conscious sin as a less evil than mere innocence which has its root, not in choice of virtue, but in ignorance of vice, and holds that the advance from innocence to virtue can only be through sin,[2] does not favour the theory of the indispensableness of a forgiveness of sin mediated through JESUS CHRIST to humanity. But in its insistence on the essential unity of GOD and man, which has led to the modern platitude of "the humanity of GOD and the divinity of man," it might be found to possess something in common with the Christian philosophy of the Incarnation. The trend of modern theology, subject to these influences of our age, is, accordingly, to develop the doctrine on its ethical side, and to find its spiritual principle in a perfect penitence or a perfect obedience. CHRIST is, however, more to us than the Mind of GOD made visible in humanity. He is not only a revelation of Divine love; He is also the Redeemer of man.

Both Professor Denney and Principal Forsyth, leading Nonconformist divines, work back from the Crucifixion to the Incarnation. Dr. Denney writes: "CHRIST'S life, taking it as it stands in the Gospels, only enters into the

[1] See Illingworth, "Divine Immanence," p. 104.
[2] McTaggart, "Studies in Hegelian Cosmology," pp. 234-243.

Atonement, and has reconciling power, because it is pervaded from beginning to end by the consciousness of His death . . . His life attains its true interpretation only as we find in it everywhere the power and purpose of His death. . . . Instead of saying that CHRIST's life as well as His death contributed to the Atonement—that His active obedience (to use the theological formula) as well as His passive obedience was essential to His propitiation—we should rather say that His life is part of His death; a deliberate and conscious descent, ever deeper and deeper, into the dark valley where at the last hour the last reality of sin was to be met and borne."[1] While, according to Dr. Forsyth, "Our faith begins with the historic Christ. . . . We begin, in principle, if not in method, with CHRIST crucified."[2] Again: "The Church's belief in the divinity of CHRIST is the result of her experience of justifying faith, of being restored and raised into the communion of GOD by union with His CHRIST in faith. To be united with CHRIST is, in our experience, to be united with GOD. Therefore CHRIST is GOD. I am redeemed in CHRIST, and only GOD can redeem."[3] Again: "The divinity of CHRIST is what the Church was driven upon to explain the effect on it of the Cross."[4] Again: "It is more true to speak of the atoning life of CHRIST than of His atoning death. He is the atoning Person, Whose crisis, effect, and key is in His death. That act of His is the clue to all His action, because it was latent in it; for He was born as the result of a death; He died in Heavenly places before the foundation of the world. . . . Behind everything He was and did here was the volume of a premundane volition. . . . In His death He Himself

[1] "The Atonement and the Modern Mind," *Expositor*, October, 1903, p. 260.
[2] "Cruciality of the Cross," p. 26.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 28.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

found Himself fully. And His expiring groan was also the relieved sigh of self-realisation. So that, if we are to choose the less of two errors, it is more true, with Paul, to let the life of Christ pale in the light of the Cross, than to let the Cross and its Atonement be lost behind His personal life."[1]

Is this the more correct and logical method of approaching this great subject? Does our belief in the divinity of our LORD depend upon our experience of salvation? If so, would not the mere intellectual assent to His divinity be a proof of saving efficacy in lives that are neither good nor Christian? Instead of making our Christology turn on a Soterology, or doctrine of a Saviour, we should rather base that doctrine on a sound Christology, or doctrine of CHRIST. Were He not *Deus immanens*, He were not *Deus reconcilians*.

Accordingly, instead of regarding the Atonement as the key of the Incarnation, we look upon the Incarnation as the key of the Atonement. CHRIST is the SON of GOD and the Son of Man, the head of the race, the representative of GOD to man and of man to GOD—the perfect expression of the Divine in human life. And He must be this if He is to be the Sin-bearer of the race, if He is to be the Mediator, and the High-Priest of humanity, and the Lamb of GOD. For otherwise His relation to man would not be spiritual nor universal.

This unique and representative position may be artificial in the eyes of those who approach His personality solely from the human or solely from the Divine side. But it was His Incarnation that is the secret of His Atonement. Because He was the Word made flesh—the Word in its ethical dynamic, if not in its transcendent power—He was the manifestation of the righteousness of GOD, and His death was the vindication of that righteousness.

[1] "Cruciality of the Cross," pp. 140 *et seq.*

Because He was the righteousness of GOD in human life, He was equipped for the conquest of evil, and for His unique position as the representative of all men—the only perfect Man, the only complete manhood in which our humanity is carried to completion, and accordingly finds its head. Because His Personality was unique and universal, His relation to man is unique and universal. He is the Head of the Body of mankind, in which it finds its unity, its principle of development, purpose, and completion as an organism.

In the Incarnation we see, therefore, a new bond between GOD and man, the forming of a new relationship based on the humanity of the Word—a kinship that was expressed and knit by the sympathy and suffering of the Man of Sorrows, and which is the means of our deification. "GOD became man that we might become divine"[1] "CHRIST became what we are to make us what He is."[2] The purpose of the Divine promises, according to 2 Peter,[3] is that "we might be partakers of the Divine nature."

The restoration of man's nature by the great fact of the Incarnation is, as has been frequently pointed out,[4] characteristic of the whole of Patristic theology. And, as Dr. Illingworth has said,[5] "In our Christian view the Incarnation was redemptive. It was an Atonement. . . . For there is one department of the world in which demonstrably the reign of law breaks down." In the case of man, "his will is conscious of a moral law, yet disobeys it." "This condition is quite accurately described in the New Testament as lawlessness (*ἀνομία*), and involves a real breach of universal order—a miracle in the objectionable sense of the term. And it cannot be

[1] Athanasius. [2] Irenæus. [3] *Ibid.*, i. 3, 4.
[4] See Norris, "Rudiments of Theology," p. 293.
[5] "Divine Immanence," pp. 104 *et seq.*

too often repeated that this condition of humanity is no philosophical hypothesis or theological dogma, but a perfectly familiar fact of our daily experience—an experience which is apt, indeed, to be overlooked in our more ordinary moments, simply because it is so habitual, but which from time to time arrests us with an intensity of awfulness which language has no power to express. It is at once as certain as, and more stupendous than, any other fact that we know."

Now, a primary object of the Incarnation, as Christians believe, was to remedy this lawlessness, to restore this inordinate state of humanity to order. And historically this has been its effect. Real Christians in every age have both experienced and exhibited the gradual recovery of their entire personality to order. The work of JESUS CHRIST, therefore, comes before us, not as an hypothetical breach of Nature's laws, but as the actual restoration of those laws when obviously and beyond controversy broken —the counteraction of the "miracle of sin."

His Incarnation developed naturally and logically as an Atonement. There was a moral unity in the spirit in which He lived and died, expressed in His own phrase: "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life as a ransom for many."[1] His Personality and His Will were one. There was a true development of His life from one scene of sorrow to another, from one act of obedience to another, until the drama of sorrow and obedience found its culmination and explanation in Calvary. There His love and righteousness, His self-sacrifice and devotion, found their true focus in the sublimest act of His Passion, which did not, however, mark any new phase of His spiritual activity. The Incarnation itself involved a greater humiliation for the SON of GOD than Calvary implied for the Son of Man.

[1] Matt. xx. 28.

The struggle with evil may then have reached its most intense point, but He had experienced the stress and strain of evil ever since the Divine Spirit drove Him into the wilderness.[1] There was a continuous struggle and conflict beneath that mild exterior. At times the veil is moved aside and the secret workings of His Spirit are revealed.[2] The writer of the Fourth Gospel, who gazes upon Calvary from the high standpoint of his Prologue—the Pre-existence of the Word—regards His death as a triumph. But there are delicate touches in his portrait which reveal deep emotion and sorrow in the Son of Man. The principle of His life, typified by the seed-corn[3]—His own illustration—was "a dying to live," a dissolution of life that was to lead to greater dissemination and development of life. It was the Man with the marks of suffering on His brow that was pointed out by the Baptist as the Lamb of GOD. He laid down His life on the Cross, but all through His career He had been laying down His life. And therefore His death was not the climax of an agony, but a crowning triumph, the victory of the principle of self-sacrifice. "Now is the Son of Man glorified, and GOD is glorified in Him."[4] This view does not detract from the value of His death, while it reveals the activities of His life. It was not only on Calvary that He bore the Cross.[5] He Who is the best interpreter of His own life

[1] Mark i. 12. *ἐκβάλλει.*

[2] *E.g.*, Luke xi. 50: "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened until it be accomplished"; xxii. 24: "And being in an agony, He prayed yet more earnestly; and His sweat became as it were great drops of blood"; John xii. 27: "Now is My soul troubled; and what shall I say? FATHER, save Me from this hour"; xi. 33: "He groaned in spirit and was troubled"; xi. 35: "He wept"; xi. 38; "groaning" (*ἐμβριμώμενος*); xii. 31: "The prince of this world shall be cast out"; xiv. 30: "The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in Me"; xvi. 11: "Because the prince of this world is judged."

[3] John xii. 24. [4] *Ibid.*, xiii. 31.

[5] See Mark viii. 34; Matt. x. 38, xvi. 24; Luke xiv. 27; Matt. x. 38: "when sending out the Twelve"; Matt. xvi. 24: "after Peter's

regarded His whole life as such. "If any will come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow Me." His whole life, mission, and teaching of the kingdom was "the word or doctrine of the Cross."[1] "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven"; "Blessed are they that mourn"; "Blessed are ye when men shall reprove you and persecute you, and say all manner of evil things against you for My sake" (Matt. v. 2, 11).

He regarded death in general as a sleep. "Our friend Lazarus hath gone to sleep"; "She is not dead, but sleepeth."[2] And His own death He describes as a consummation—"I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I am perfected"[3]—as a going to the FATHER: "I came forth from the FATHER and came into the world. Again I leave the world and proceed[4] to My FATHER." He used a more dignified word of His passing than of His coming. It is described as an *exodus*.[5] He says: "I lay down My life that I may take it again. . . . This commandment have I received from My FATHER."[6]

As far as His relation to the FATHER was concerned, it is evident that the thought of complete reunion with that FATHER Whose felt presence and union with Him had been the comfort of His life,[7] buoyed up His spirit in the

---

rebuke"; Luke xiv. 27: in the Peræa, He put the matter plainly before them as "a deterrent in a high degree suggesting a procession of furciferi, headed by JESUS, and consisting of His followers" (Professor Swete on Mark viii. 34).

[1] 1 Cor. i. 18: "developed by St. Paul."

[2] John xi. 11; Matt. ix. 24.

[3] τελειοῦμαι. *Cf.* Heb. ii. 10: "It became Him . . . to perfect τελειῶσαι, the captain of their salvation through sufferings."

[4] πορεύομαι, a more dignified word than ἐλήλυθα (John xvi. 28).

[5] Luke ix. 31. [6] John x. 18.

[7] John xiii. 20: "He that receiveth Me receiveth Him that sent Me"; xiv. 7: "If ye had known Me, ye had known the FATHER also"; xiv. 9: "He that hath seen Me hath seen the FATHER"; xiv. 11: "I am in the FATHER and the FATHER in Me"; xv. 23:

most depressing situations. He regarded His passing with joy as the means of such reunion, and by reason of such reunion in the Spirit with the FATHER as the way to greater spiritual power—a higher, more glorious existence. And although His spirit longed for such reunion, it was brought about in a manner that could not but grieve His soul. It was not death itself—which He never regarded as penal—or an exhibition of the Divine wrath against sin. It was not the physical pain and suffering of the wounded, lacerated form. It was not the actual passing —which would seem to be more pleasant than otherwise from the happy expression of the dead, and which is a common experience—but it was the circumstances of His death that caused Him pain. It was the κεφαλαίωσις, or summing up of the world's hatred, hostility, and sin, manifested in its rejection of the Holy One of GOD,[1] the bitter antagonism to righteousness, the intensity of hate, and the depth of moral degradation that the deep damnation of His "taking-off" revealed in man, that enhanced the poignancy of His sorrow, even as it afforded a background which increased by contrast of moral colouring the sublime manifestation of obedience, and the love that suffers in order to save. To His death He referred as something that ought not to be, but was to be. It was the natural and logical result of His life, character, and mission in such an environment and under such conditions. "In such a situation," writes Plato in his "Republic,"[2] "the just man will be scourged, racked, fettered, will have his eyes burnt out, and at last, after suffering every kind of torture, will be crucified, and thus will learn that it is best, not to be, but to seem, just."

And yet our LORD regarded His death as a triumph:

"He that hateth Me hateth My FATHER also"; xvi. 32: I am not alone, because the FATHER is with Me."

[1] Matt. xxiii. 33. [2] P. 362.

"And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Myself"; "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world"—a triumph in which the nature of sin and righteousness and the certainty of judgment were revealed, as His Spirit would help men to realise;[1] a triumph, too, that was to be the means of man's redemption from sin,[2] but which was to cost Him His heart's blood, both in a spiritual as well as in a physical sense. There was a mysterious conflict before Him which convulsed His soul with a great emotion. It was the spiritual struggle with the concentrated powers of darkness, when His spirit was enfeebled by the physical prostration of His dying body, that gave a unique, an awful character to the passing of the Son of Man, and caused Him at times to dread the tasting of the cup, and by preparing His disciples for His Passion to prepare Himself. His voluntary submission to death He regarded as the final test of His love for the FATHER and His submission to that FATHER'S wish. In His death He was a free agent: "I have *power* to lay it (*i.e.*, life) down, and *power* to take it again."[3]

Such was the way in which the CHRIST regarded His own death. How has mankind, how has the Church, regarded it? Death is always—as far as this earthly life is concerned—the termination of a career, however glorious, useful, and noble. When it is the hero's death, like that of Nelson's, it is the crown of his past achievements, the grandest proof of his patriotic spirit, his devotion to duty. But when it is the death of such a Personality as the CHRIST it assumes an unearthly character; it is a Divine consummation. The Cross was

[1] John xvi. 8.

[2] "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many" (Mark x. 45; Matt. xx. 28).

[3] Matt. x. 18.

the culmination of His work, His crowning act of obedience, His sublimest deed of sacrifice. In regard to the FATHER, His death was a declaration of GOD'S righteousness. It was a dying rather than deny His FATHER; and in regard to humanity, it was the proof of His own perfect submission and obedience, the crown of His life of self-sacrifice, the exhibition of a perfectly obedient life which did not fear the most extreme test in its adherence to principle in humanity, which not only led to the exaltation of His own manhood, but to that of manhood in general.[1] The humiliation of the Son of Man leadeth to the uplifting of the sons of men. His death on the Cross—although the manner of His death is not declared to be divinely appointed—was an appropriate termination of the career which began in a manger. There was a moral *fitness* in His death which Greek theology perceived with a true instinct.[2] Others go farther, and say that "had He not died, His obedience would have lacked just that element which made it an Atonement for sin. The obedience was intended to issue in death."[3]

As against this latter view, we have the memorable saying of Bernard: "Non mors sed voluntas"[4] (It was not His death, but His willing acceptance, that pleased GOD). To those who interpret our LORD'S great sacrifice in the light of the Jewish sacrificial system and its procedure—which is an interpretation of the greater by the less—His sacrifice was only completed by His death, and thus the belief of *salus in sanguine* arose.[5] It is quite possible that the very fact of the presentation of the

[1] Rom. iii. 24; Phil. ii. 8-11; *cf.* Heb. x. 9, 10; *cf.* Hooker, "Eccles. Polity," v. 51, 3.

[2] *E.g.*, Ath., "De Incarn.," vi.; Gregory of Nyssa, "Orat. Cat.," 22.

[3] "Lux Mundi," c. vii., p. 214.

[4] "De erroribus Abelardi," § 21.

[5] *Ibid.*, § 22.

blood in the Temple gave death a significance—strange to the Gentile—in the eye of the Jew. In the Talmud we read that "all who die are reconciled through death";[1] while the death of martyrs, who are assigned a special place in Heaven, being more severe, is described as more potent for reconciliation.[2]

Could our LORD have atoned without dying? This is a question we dare not presume to answer; but the Gospels attach a tremendous significance to that death, apparently apart from the obedience completed in it, a considerable portion of the records being concerned with the narrative of the Cross and Passion. They also reveal the work of the Son of Man Who came to seek and save that which was lost. This fact is to be taken into account in any view of the Atonement which professes to be founded upon the Gospels.

And the place assigned to the Death of CHRIST in the Epistles is no less important, as may be seen in the following passages: "Looking unto JESUS, the author and finisher of our faith, Who, for the joy that was set before Him, endured the Cross, despising the shame."[3] "Inasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself partook of the same, that through death He might destroy him that hath the power over death, that is the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage."[4] "CHRIST died for our sins according to the Scriptures."[5] "He is the mediator of a new covenant, that, a death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant,"[6] they that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance,

[1] "Sifre," 33 *a*.
[2] "Baba Bathra," 10 *b*. See Dr. Oesterley's "Jewish Doctrine of Mediation," p. 75.
[3] Heb. xii. 2. [4] *Ibid.*, ii. 14. [5] 1 Cor. xv. 3.
[6] Heb. ix. 15.

and "Whom GOD set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by His blood to show forth His righteousness."[1]

The Sacrifice of the Cross and Passion is thus a prominent fact in the records of His life, and must occupy an equally predominant position in every presentation of the doctrine of Atonement, for the death marks the culminating point, the *κεφαλαίωσις* of the Sacrifice of CHRIST; and we cannot but regard the Crucifixion as a completion of the Incarnation. The life which began in the self-abnegation of the SON of GOD ended appropriately in the self-renunciation of the Son of Man. This was the climax of His solidarity with us, His taking of the whole lot, the saddest lot of our humanity, upon Himself.

While we may not ask, Would the moral work of CHRIST, if not exhibited and ended in death, have atoned? even if we ourselves do not regard Christianity as a theology of blood and wounds, we cannot but remember that He described His own mission as a ministry to be crowned by death. Had He not so died, His life had not been, at least for the Jewish mind, an atonement for sin. And had He not died a violent, unjust and cruel death, He had not borne so remarkable a witness against the cruelty, violence, and injustice of the world. The triumph of Greek art, which worshipped physical beauty, was the deification of the living human form in the Hermes of Olympia; but the triumph of Jewish faith, which worshipped moral goodness, especially under pathetic conditions, like the Suffering Servant, was led to see in JESUS, and chiefly in His Cross and Passion, the humanisation of the Divine.

There was a mysterious humiliation of that death—"He humbled Himself, even to the death of the Cross."[2] But death itself is the mystery of life, the dark shadow into which One Who was one with our humanity must enter,

[1] Rom. iii. 24 *et seq.* [2] Phil. ii. 8.

and into which He entered, surrendering His humanity, crushed and slain in its very centre in its struggle with sin, in order to conquer and extinguish sin in humanity, and, as Athanasius[1] asserted, to annul the law of human corruption and death by vindicating it in His own life. Such a death may not be regarded as a mere incident or episode, but rather as the crowning manifestation of the love and goodness of CHRIST in the presence of the hatred and sin of man. The circumstances of His death evoked in a more striking form the moral qualities of the Son of Man which had been displayed all through His life. It seemed as if His human nature had been called upon for one last supreme struggle, one crowning effort. And in this sense, the victory of His death surpassed everything else in His life. There was deep mental anguish, which expressed itself in words of care and forgiveness for others. All through the centuries the FATHER and the SON and the SPIRIT had borne the sins and sorrows of humanity. All through His life—ever since the consciousness of His mission dawned upon Him—JESUS had borne the sins and sorrows of man. And on the Cross we see for a moment the grief of the Creator over His travailing Creation, the sorrow of the Divine Love as it felt the opposition to its purpose and compassion that was offered by the hatred and hostility of man. And yet His death was a victory, by reason of the Spirit of Him Who died, Who never for one moment thought of His own position, but of His FATHER'S purpose. "FATHER, into Thy hands I commend My spirit."[2] The Passing was in peace.

And so "we see JESUS, because of the suffering of

[1] "De Incarn.," vii.: "As we all died in Him, His death was to annul the law of human corruption, seeing that its authority had been fully asserted in the LORD'S body, and there was no ground for its enforcement against man."

[2] Luke xxiii. 46.

death, crowned with glory and honour: that by the grace of GOD He should taste death for every man"[1]—that is, His death had a universal efficacy and an eternal significance for man. As Jowett remarks: "Not the sacrifice, nor the satisfaction, nor the ransom, but the greatest moral act ever done in the world, is the assurance that GOD in CHRIST is reconciled to the world."[2] His death for Himself was the entrance to a larger, diviner life. It was a virtual dying to live, a death that opened up immense possibilities for Himself and humanity. But it was in keeping with the unselfish character of Him Who said to the weeping women, "Ye daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for Me, but weep for yourselves and for your children,"[3] that He dwelt more upon the expediency of His departure for His disciples, and how He was going to prepare a place for them, and to send them another Comforter. "If ye loved Me, ye would rejoice because I said, I go unto My FATHER, for the FATHER is greater than I."[4]

The central purpose of His death was to unite GOD and man in a love that could not be quenched by the waters of death, and to effect a spiritual union between GOD and man that could not be severed by sin, by the manifestation of a love that penetrated the shades of death, and the revelation of a holiness that magnified the sinfulness of sin. If His death was the triumph of holiness, it was the victory of love.

To separate that death from the preceding life is, however, a false abstraction. For while we see in His voluntary (not gratuitous)[5] death the strongest possible

[1] Heb. ii. 9. [2] "St. Paul's Epistles," ii. 481.
[3] Luke xxiii. 28. [4] John xiv. 28.
[5] Principal Forsyth objects to "self-chosen." "We have to say that it involved obedience of no gratuitous and arbitrary kind, no 'voluntary humility,' no self-willed, self-chosen obedience, no self-created task, as the manner of some devotees is, but it obeyed the

proof and the highest point of His perfect sympathy and identification with us, we also ask Him to deliver us "by the mystery of His Incarnation." Through His Incarnation He felt what man really was, and what he could become; and He manifested to men the image and likeness of GOD, unto which He enables men to attain by reason of His indwelling SPIRIT, Who applies to their souls the balm of pardon which the Son of Man died in order to give—not to obtain or win for, but to impart to the sons of men—and the regenerating influence of a life in union with GOD in CHRIST. This was His gift, as He was the FATHER'S gift to the race—a gift of life. And, as St. Paul perceived, it was the life that issued from such a death, victorious over self, triumphant over sin, and pregnant with the future ideals and hopes of men, that we hope to share, and by which we are saved. "Having been reconciled by His death, much more shall we be saved by His life."[1] And in the Epistle to the Hebrews it is the life that passed through death triumphant that is "the new and living way," consecrated by His death, by which humanity has access to GOD.[2]

Consequently, it seems to be a false abstraction to consider the death of CHRIST as possessing a special significance apart from His life, or to consider His life apart from His death. The relation of the Incarnation to the Atonement may be represented by that of the inside of a shield to the outside, the inner being the incarnate Life as it concealed and faced the Deity, the outer being the same Life as it confronted man, and revealed itself in its holiness, its love, its grace, and its mercy to man. It seems impossible to conceive how man can put asunder what GOD hath joined together in a

---

necessity of an actual historic and spiritual situation" ("Cruciality of the Cross," p. 213).

[1] Rom. v. 10. [2] Heb. x. 20.

union which might be expressed in this way—that if the Atonement were the motive of the Incarnation, the Incarnation was the means of the Atonement; and while the Incarnation reveals the purpose of the Creation, the Atonement serves to consummate it; and while it is given to some to approach the Incarnation through the Atonement, it is given to others, and those the least tainted with Arianism, to approach the Atonement from the Incarnation, and to see it in the light of the perfect Sonship towards GOD and the perfect brotherhood towards man.

The truth is, we cannot end with Incarnation nor begin with Atonement. Weak views of Incarnation lead to weak views of Atonement. Ritschlianism did not face the question of Incarnation and the Divinity of our LORD; it also overlooked the problem of sin and its atonement. This is not so much a strange coincidence as a logical consequence. In fact, the doctrine of the Atonement presupposes an incarnation of a Divine Being, otherwise His death were but a martyrdom. And this was evidently felt by St. Paul, who bases redemption on the Incarnation in Col. i. 14: "In Whom we have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins, Who is the image of the invisible GOD, the firstborn of all creation: for by Him were all things created." The writer to the Hebrews, who represents the high-priestly work of CHRIST in His sacrifice and intercession, begins from the Divine origin of the SON of GOD, "the heir of all things, through Whom also He made the worlds, the very image of His substance, and upholding all things by the word of His power."[1]

An exclusive interest in the Cross as a means of redemption is just as lacking in the proportion of faith as an exclusive interest in the Incarnation. Accordingly,

[1] Heb. i. 2-3.

"the placing the emphasis too exclusively upon the death of JESUS as the necessity of redemption" is justly deprecated in "Contentio Veritatis."[1] In many passages the Resurrection and Death as the way of resurrection is predominant—*e.g.*, "I am the Resurrection and the Life"; "And I, if I be lifted up out of the earth"—out of this sphere—"shall draw all men unto Myself."[2] Here there is a distinct reference to the Resurrection. "He died on behalf of all, that those who lived might no longer live unto themselves, but unto Him Who on their behalf died and was raised";[3] "And if CHRIST be not raised, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins."[4]

Accordingly, to regard the death of CHRIST apart from His Resurrection—I will not go so far as to say as anything else than the necessary antecedent of His Resurrection—but as a process capable of being separated in thought, significance, and efficacy from that Resurrection,[5] in which it found its culmination and the means of making the Cross and Passion a universal power in humanity, is to make another false abstraction.

Athanasius, with his logical mind, saw the Resurrection as the completion of the Incarnation. "His purpose," he wrote, "was to turn men again to incorruption, and quicken them from death to life, by His appropriation of a human body and by the grace of His Resurrection utterly consuming death as straw is consumed by fire."[6] But we cannot even stop there. We must proceed to the spiritual completion of that Resurrection of which the Apostles were appointed witnesses, even Pentecost, when the Spirit of the Risen JESUS endowed the Church with undying faith in Him Who was dead, but is alive for evermore.

[1] Third Essay, by H. L. Wild.
[2] John xi. 25; xii. 32.
[3] 2 Cor. v. 15.
[4] 1 Cor. xv. 17.
[5] In 2 Cor. v. 15: "Who for their sakes died and rose again." The Resurrection is joined with His Death as a work for men.
[6] "De Incarn," p. 8.

Furthermore, it is clear that we may not base our view of the Atonement upon the interpretation of Mosaic ritual or the Jewish sacrificial system, of which the writer to the Hebrews makes a bold sweep; for, as Dr. Davidson remarks, "None of the prophets, not even Ezekiel, refers to sacrifice as the means of atonement for the sins of the people. GOD forgives of His grace and mercy alone."[1] The ideas of redemption and remission by the shedding of blood are, however, deeply rooted in the Old Testament theology, and have been carried into the New Testament by various writers. In the Hebrew we have *gullah*, of a civil redemption of property or person; *copher* (from *kipper*, to cover and atone) and *pidyon* (*padah*), of ransom, in a religious sense, of the firstborn.[2] The word *goel*, meaning next-of-kin, or representative, because it was incumbent on such to redeem and avenge their relatives, is effectively used in Job xix. 25, "I know that my Redeemer liveth"; and Deutero-Isaiah lix. 20, "And a Redeemer shall come to Israel"; and Ps. xix. 15, "O LORD, my Rock and my Redeemer"; and in other passages in which the property relation gives place to a representative personal relation.

The New Testament writers describe our LORD as our λύτρον and ἀντίλυτρον, or ransom,[3] Who has, in the figurative language of the redemption process, bought us,[4] or effected our ἀπολύτρωσις,[5] redemption or deliverance—an *aeonian* λύτρωσις[6] and loosed us (λύσαντι)

[1] "Theology of the Old Testament," p. 330.

[2] גְּאֻלָּה ; כֹּפֶר ; פִּדְיוֹן. See Ex. xxi. 30; xiii. 15; Ps. xlix. 7, 8.

[3] Mark x. 45; Matt. xx. 28, λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν; 1 Tim. ii. 6, ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων.

[4] Acts xx. 28, περιεποιήσατο; Gal. iii. 13, ἐξηγόρασεν; 1 Cor. vi. 20, ἠγορασθῆτε τιμῆς; 2 Pet. ii. 1, τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτούς; Rev. v. 9, ἠγόρασας τῷ θεῷ ἡμᾶς; 1 Pet. i. 18, ἐλυτρώθητε: "You were redeemed not with corruptible things."

[5] Luke xxi. 28; Rom. iii. 24; Eph. i. 7.

[6] Heb. ix. 12

from our sins;[1] and in one passage, which recalls the use of *Goel* as Representative, as our *Paraclete*, or Advocate with the FATHER.[2]

The abstruse discussion as to whom the ransom was paid, which taxed the intellectual energies of theologians for many centuries, is a sad instance of the truth of the saying: "The letter killeth; the spirit giveth life." According to the old school, the ransom was paid to the devil; according to the members of the modern school who consider the question, it was paid to the law of holiness,[3] to "sin and evil,"[4] to "that ultimate necessity which has made the whole course of things what it has been,"[5] or to death.[6] But the idea to be associated with λύτρον is not payment, nor a forensic transaction between GOD the FATHER and GOD the SON,"[7] but the process of man's deliverance from the tyranny of self and sin. Norris,[8] who regards *copher* as expiation, takes λύτρον in the same sacrificial sense. Ritschl,[9] who sees in it a

[1] Rev. i. 5; *v.l.* λούσαντι, washed.
[2] 1 John ii. 1, 2. [3] Dale. [4] Briggs.
[5] Sanday. [6] Wendt.
[7] Translative (metaphorically), *pretium nuncupatur* (Abelard).
[8] Norris, "Rudiments of Theology," p. 173: "We may sum up this long digression on the word λύτρον by saying that it means *expiation*, not ransom."
[9] "Justification and Reconciliation," ii., pp. 87, 204: "His guiltless death serves to shield the members of His community from experiencing in death complete annihilation and frustration of the end of existence." "This has no reference to the sins of the same" (see Orr, "Ritschlianism," p. 153). See Wendt's view, "Die Lehre Jesu," ii. 515: "He teaches them through His example to rise in pious humility and certainty of salvation above death, and so to change death from being a fearful tyrant into a means of salvation." Again, in ii. 237, Wendt retains the ransom-idea, but points out that its effect is to deliver us from the bondage of sin and death by teaching us to adopt our LORD'S valuation of those evils. Dr. Stevens, "Christian Doctrine of Salvation," regards it in a figurative sense —namely, that the Death had a saving effect on mankind. See Professor Beet, *Expositor*, May, 1898, p. 374; and Dr. Dale, "The Atonement," p. 357. See Westcott, "Hebrews," p. 296, on figurative character of language.

translation of the Hebrew *copher*, considers it as a covering of our creatureliness—a protective covering of the offerers before the face of GOD, because they are perishable men, not because they are sinners. According to this view, it shelters from the majesty of GOD, removes awe and fear, and enables us to approach GOD by stimulating us to a self-denying imitation of CHRIST.[1] We must, indeed, allow that the term is figurative, being borrowed from the redemption language used in connection with the Exodus, and conveys the idea that there was a saving efficacy in the life and death of CHRIST. "The phraseology before us," writes Professor Beet, "is simply an appropriate and forceful mode of expressing the infinite costliness of our salvation, and the absolute necessity of the death of CHRIST as the only means by which it could be brought about. CHRIST is the ransom-price of our redemption." And whether He saves us from worldly ambition,[2] or from the fear of death,[3] or from the tyranny of self and sin, His work may surely be regarded as a λύτρον, an instrument of deliverance—that which loosed man, and, with emancipation from the fetters of the past, has for man the remission of sins, as Who should say, "Loose him and let him go."[4] For such a λύτρον leads to such an ἄφεσις.

Familiarity with the Jewish sacrifices caused the Jewish writers to see an especial virtue in the very shedding of blood, the αἱματεκχυσία, which was regarded as the consummation of the sacrifice.[5] "Without shedding of blood there is no remission," exclaimed the writer to the Hebrews, and even if the rigour of the sentence is modi-

[1] "Justification and Reconciliation," ii. 85.
[2] Beyschlag. [3] Wendt.
[4] λύσατε αὐτὸν καὶ ἄφετε ὑπάγειν, John xi. 44. *Cf.* use of λύτρον and ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν: Mark i. 4; Luke iii. 3; Luke xxiv. 7; Rom. iii. 25; Heb. ix. 22: "Without shedding of blood there is no remission"; x. 18: "Where remission is, there is no more offering for sin."
[5] Curtiss, "Prim. Sem. Rel.," p. 223.

fied by the σχεδόν,[1] or "almost" of the previous clause, there is no doubt that the actual manifestation of the sacrificial blood meant much to a Jew; and that our LORD'S words, "This is the blood of the New Covenant, which is shed for the remission of sins,"[2] were a concession to a realistic mode of thinking which is not Western. The very repugnance of refined thought to such an expression, and to such imagery as "There is a fountain filled with blood," creates the necessity of interpreting the underlying idea in terms of modern thought. That idea is supremely ethical and spiritual; it is the surrender of life by a voluntary death, the conquest of sin by a life that pierced the shades of death, and passed into the presence of GOD. It was a transcending of sin, and in consequence a removal of the doom of death.

And the explanation is found in the passage: "For the soul—or the life of the flesh— is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to atone for your souls—or your lives—for the blood atones by reason of the soul—or life."[3] As symbol of the life,[4] which was supposed to reside in the blood, the significance of the blood was immense. It was a sacred thing for the Jew. But the mere shedding of blood must not be regarded as a thing to be considered by itself. For any other form of death—strangling or drowning—would have been equally effectual. It is a false abstraction, as the writer to the Hebrews saw, to consider His death apart from the spirit of love and obedience in which He died,[5] the Will by which we are sanctified. It is to reduce to a purely physical incident an event fraught with a transcendent moral power in the life

[1] *Cf.* Acts. xiii. 44; xix. 26, as *fere* used with πᾶς.
[2] Matt. xxvi. 28; *cf.* Mark xiv. 24.
[3] Lev. xvii. 11.
[4] Clement of Alexandria, "Paed.," i. 127: "The same blood and milk is a symbol of the Passion and doctrine of our LORD."
[5] Heb. x. 9: "Lo, I come to do Thy will, O GOD."

of humanity. The fact that the effusion of blood may have been regarded as the central rite, and as an *opus operatum* in ceremonial matters—but only in such—by the Jews, and that the *taurobolion*—or baptism in the blood of a bull—was one of the mystic rites of Mithraism, which began to flourish in Rome at the end of the first century of our era,[1] most probably led to this false emphasis on the physical proof of death. The blood of CHRIST signifies the new life that flowed into humanity from the crucified and risen life of the Son of Man. That life was given for our remission;[2] that life given to us purges our conscience from dead works.[3] Early controversies with Docetics may also have caused emphasis to be laid upon that which was a visible sign of a real humanity,[4] His humanity in its suffering and atoning aspect, in the medium in which He suffered and was slain, in which He crushed sin, conquered death, and consummated His obedience for and in the humanity He represented; in which victory He would have us participate by means of His indwelling SPIRIT in His Church—the extension of His Incarnation throughout humanity, the temple of the SPIRIT through Whom we are made one with CHRIST, and CHRIST is made one with us in a perfected Atonement consummated within our own personality, we dwelling in CHRIST and CHRIST dwelling in us. And thus, as Clement of Alexandria[5] says, "We are joined with CHRIST in kinship with Him on account of the blood (His humanity) by which

[1] Statius, "Thebais," Book i., is the first writer to mention it.
[2] Matt. xxvi. 28. [3] Heb. ix. 14.
[4] This may be the reason why the blood is so emphatically mentioned in the Gospel and First Epistle of St. John, and in the Epistles of St. Paul and that to the Hebrews. Clement of Alexandria, "Paed.," ii. 177, distinguishes the spiritual aspect of the blood from the material: "The blood of the LORD is twofold: one kind carnal, by which we are redeemed from destruction; and the other kind spiritual, that by which we are anointed."
[5] "Paed.," i. 127.

we are redeemed," and we verily eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, by our realisation of His organic and spiritual union with man, and by participation in His sacrifice of love and obedience.

Our LORD did not refer to His blood as possessing cleansing efficacy, but to His word and His washing: "and ye are clean (*καθαροί*) through the word (*τὸν λόγον*) which I have spoken unto you,"[1] because it was the word of life; "And ye are clean (*καθαροί*), but not all."[2] And there was a purification for ceremonial offences in the Jewish Church by washing,[3] flour,[4] and incense.[5] Furthermore, the zeal of Phinehas[6] and the intercession of Moses,[7] and not bloody sacrifices, which could never take away wilful or moral sin in the Jewish economy,[8] are represented as turning away the anger of Yahveh.

Sacrifice for the ordinary Jew undoubtedly was an expression of the sense of human insufficiency and the natural desire to fill up that deficiency from an external source; but if he thought about the *rationale* of sacrifice, it was as purely an outward sign of the offerer's subjective

[1] John xv. 3. *Cf.* "I will; be thou cleansed," Mark i. 41; Luke v. 13; and "Create in me a clean heart, O GOD," Ps. li. 10.

[2] John xiii. 10.

[3] Exod. xix. 10: "Go unto the people and sanctify them . . . and let them wash their clothes."

[4] Lev. v. 11.

[5] "Aaron put on incense, and made an atonement for the people" (Numb. xvi. 47).

[6] Numb. xxv. 11.

[7] Exod. xxxii.

[8] "But the soul that doeth ought presumptuously (or with a high hand) shall be cut off" (Numb. xv. 30). *Cf.* Deut. xvii. 12. The *Chattath*, or sin-offering, was offered for ceremonial offences committed in ignorance—מְשִׁגְגוֹת (Numb. xv. 27)—and implies no idea of moral offences. The *'Asham*, or guilt-offering, implied compensation for ceremonial offences done unwittingly (as the Greek equivalent *τὸ ὑπὲρ ἀγνοίας* implies) only. But in Isa. liii. 10, "Thou shalt make his life an *'asham*," it had a deeper signification, because by that time the deeper need was felt.

feeling of dependence, repentance, and devotion. The sacrificial system ideally had a subjective as well as an objective aspect. It was subjective as representing the spirit in which the offering was made, objective in the presentation of that offering. But we can well believe that except among the rare examples of the higher type of mind, it was purely objective and ritualistic, a result to which the tendency of humanity to seek external satisfaction and support for its manifold needs of body, soul, and spirit—hardly distinguishable in that low stage of psychological development when the sacrificial system prevailed—would materially conduce. Accordingly, the School of Magee, which regarded sacrifice as a symbol of an objective propitiation,[1] and consequent reconciliation to GOD, would describe the then popular opinion of sacrifice more accurately than the School of Bähr, which regarded it as an outward symbol of the feelings of repentance and self-dedication to GOD. But the pious and thoughtful Jew, who could distinguish between act and motive, thought and its manifestation, as well as between restoration of ecclesiastical rights and access to GOD, had something more soul-satisfying in his sorrow and trouble than the sacrificial system, which he had tried and found wanting—even the presence of GOD within, cleansing and strengthening by renewing in him a clean heart and a new spirit.

[1] This theory, based on the principle of substitution and expiation, but which could only have developed after consciousness of sin had arisen, was perhaps the most external and most intelligible to the populace. The idea of appeasing the gods by gifts is repudiated by Cicero ("De Leg.," ii. 16): "Let not the impious dare to appease GOD with gifts. Let them listen to Plato, who warns them that there can be no doubt of what GOD'S disposition to them will be, since even a good man will refuse to accept presents from the wicked." According to Robertson Smith, the sacramental meal of totemistic times, when animals were considered akin both to the worshippers and their god, gave place to the sacrificial feast and holocausts which we find among the Jews when that mode of thought disappeared; and these in the first instances were human victims, but afterwards animals were sub-

Whatever may have been the origin of sacrifice, whether we accept the propitiation theory or the prayer theory (Philo and Bähr), or the sacramental meal theory (Robertson Smith), or the homage theory (Maurice), or the gift theory (Spencer), or combine all these in one general view, it seems that the Jewish sacrificial system was intended to wean the people from the heathen sacrifices to which they had been accustomed. The ordinance of sacrifice is represented as given by GOD, even as the ordinances of Baptism and Holy Communion were appointed by CHRIST, and He Himself was given by the FATHER to man. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and *I have given it to you* upon the altar to atone for your lives." These sacrifices may be regarded as sacraments,[1] the blood of the offering signifying the life of the offerer, who had laid his hand upon it, and dedicated it to GOD in service and obedience. Accordingly, the animals offered were selected for their innocence, freedom from

---

stituted. May not this substitution underlie the whole theory of substitution in the Jewish sacrificial system? The gift-theory of Spencer, which could only have developed after the idea of property had been acquired, was based by him on the custom of leaving food and drink at the graves of the dead, and then, as the ancestral spirit rose to Divine rank, the refreshments placed for the dead developed into sacrifices ("Principles of Sociology," pp. 139 *et seq.*). According to Philo, sacrifice expressed spiritual aspirations; according to Bähr, self-surrender; and, according to Maurice, an act of homage to GOD; "Sacrifice," p. 6: "Speech, thanksgiving, are not the most childlike way of testifying homage." The Ritschlian view was that "the sacrifices of the Israelites were in no way connected with the removal of guilt, but were the gifts of those already within the Covenant to assure them of their communion with Jehovah" (Edgehill, "Ritschlianism," p. 226). The LXX, Ritschl says, mistranslated כִּפֶּר (*kipper*), to cover, by ἱλάσκεσθαι, to atone.

[1] The sacramental theory of sacrifice has been held by men of opposite schools—*e.g.*, Scott ("Sacrifice," p. 288), a Protestant theologian, and Hunter, a Roman divine ("Dogmat. Theol.," iii. 172); Bähr (ii., p. 211), and Cave, who refutes Bähr (pp. 138 *et seq.*); also by Robertson Smith. It depends on what view of Sacrament is held. In this place it is used in the Anglican sense (see Prayer-Book Catechism).

blemish, and guilelessness. St. Paul laid his finger on the really catholic element in sacrifice, the offering and dedicating of the human spirit to GOD. "Present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto GOD, which is your reasonable service."[1] If the FATHER was satisfied by the death of the SON, it was not the death itself, but that which it represented—the detachment of the spirit from the world and its surrender in love and obedience to Himself—that satisfied. This was the underlying reality—the inward and the spiritual represented by the outward and the visible. The mistake the Jewish Church made was to confound the sign with the reality, which led to the revolt of psalmist and prophet, a mistake that was repeated in the Christian Church and led to a similar reaction. "The sacrifices of GOD are a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart, O GOD, thou wilt not despise."[2] "To what purpose," writes Isaiah, "is the multitude of your sacrifices? . . . Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings."[3] "Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice," said Samuel.[4] In the *Shema*, the summary of the law in Deuteronomy, there is no mention of sacrifice, but there is of love—a subjective feeling. The lamb and the blood were not the real things, neither are the bread and wine. And, as Sacraments, the Jewish sacrifices were superseded by the offering of the real life in which humanity was represented by Him Who identified Himself with the humanity He offered to GOD,[5] just as the Sacraments He appointed to typify that offering are to be no longer used when the

[1] Rom. xii. 1.
[2] Ps. li. 16. *Cf.* Mic. vi. 6-8.
[3] Isa. i. 11, 16.
[4] 1 Sam. xv. 22.
[5] "Who hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to GOD for a sweet-smelling savour" (Eph. v. 2). This explains why the Jewish sacrifices were typologically treated in the New Testament as prophetic in design, and also as symbolical and representative in character.

reality shall come,[1] and those who have participated in that offering, and have learnt by the sad but spiritualising experience of the sorrow that sanctifies the lesson of the literary prophets and teachers of mankind the interpretation of the elemental principles of life—that without shedding of blood, in the metaphorical sense, there is no remission—and present themselves living sacrifices to GOD, shall find the consummation of their "living sacrifices" in the real Presence of the CHRIST Who in His death gave man, not only an example of unparalleled goodness and an earnest of immortality, but also a pledge of pardon,[2] an assurance of peace. In martyrdom, it is not the suffering and wounds we respect, but the spirit of loyalty and love that proved stronger than death. How much more do we revere in CHRIST the self-sacrificing renunciation of self in His sublime life and death! For so He has become "the author of eternal salvation to all who obey Him."[3] Principal Forsyth well says of sacrifice: "It was the offerer's will that lay on the altar. What was precious was not the thing, nor the element, but the act. . . . What is offered up, therefore, is life in its most intimate, spiritual, and moral form. This does away with

[1] "Ye do show forth the LORD'S death *until* He come." This view of sacrifices allows for their transitory nature, their abandonment when greater realities appeared, and their moral lesson.

[2] Maurice, in "Sacrifice," treats the sacrifice of CHRIST as the proof of peace and reconcilement, not as its cause, and the "assurance of a bond between GOD and men, which no rebellion of theirs, which no law of His, could set aside," as "the sure declaration of GOD'S righteousness in the forgiveness of sins," as showing GOD "to be propitious, not because it in any sense made Him so." And his idea of sacrifice is "not as first rising from man to GOD, but as coming down from GOD upon man." Magee, "Discourse," i., p. 14: "The sacrifice of CHRIST was never deemed by any who did not wish to calumniate the doctrine of Atonement to have made GOD placable, but merely viewed as the means appointed by Divine wisdom through which to bestow forgiveness; and agreeably to this do we not find this sacrifice everywhere spoken of as ordained by GOD?"

[3] Heb. v. 9.

several unhappy notions. It does away with the notion that the pleasing, satisfying, atoning thing to GOD is suffering. It destroys the idea of Atonement as consisting in equivalent pain. . . . Suffering becomes a mere condition, and not a factor in the sacrificial act. And then we get rid of the idea that the essence of the sacrifice—the *donum*—was any *thing*, any piece of property. It must be life. Blood means essential, central, personal moral life."[1]

Our LORD Himself did not refer to the cleansing power of His blood, because His life had not yet been given for man—it had not as yet issued through death into the fuller Resurrection life. It was, however, the thought of participating in the perfect death of CHRIST to sin, by the perfect eternal SPIRIT of Him Who wrought our Atonement, in "the perfect life out of death of JESUS CHRIST,"[2] and so being cleansed in spirit, that occupied the mind of His disciples. It is quite possible that the writer of 1 John i. 6, 7—"If we say that we have fellowship (*κοινωνία*) with Him and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth; but if we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship (*κοινωνία*) one with another, and the *blood of* JESUS CHRIST *cleanseth us from all sin*"—adopted his figure from the use of blood in the ratification of covenants and brotherhoods.[3] But the idea to be conveyed is independent of its material expression, and is this—that if we fulfil our parts and duties, if we walk in His light, we shall share His Spirit, and the mystical union of believers with Him will lead to their own corporate union with one another. The reality underlying this and similar expressions, therefore, is the Spirit of CHRIST the Suffering One, Who suffered most keenly of

[1] "Cruciality of the Cross," pp. 189, 191.
[2] See Du Bose, "High Priesthood," p. 192.
[3] See "Confession of St. Patrick," chap. xviii.: *reppuli sugere mammellas eorum* (B.), etc.

all by reason of His sympathy with the feelings of the Divine FATHER against Whom men had sinned, the Spirit of self-sacrifice and self-denial, the love of righteousness, the hatred of evil, the Divine pity for the woe and weakness, and the infinite sorrow for the sin of man. If we fulfil the conditions of the new life, we shall be brought into touch with that Divine, all-satisfying, all-sanctifying Spirit, compassionating and consecrating; we shall receive the moral and spiritual purification it gives, the new life it bestows, the peace it bequeaths, the refreshment it imparts, the strength it infuses, the hope and faith and love it inspires. This is the blessed result of the fellowship with CHRIST—the energising of His life made available for us through the passage of death. Just as the sap in the vine creates and sustains life in the branches, this imparted life of CHRIST cleanses from sin.[1]

Accordingly, the purifying element in the Atonement was not the actual human blood of the human body of our LORD, but the Spirit or Will in which the life, of which the blood was a sign and channel, was released from its earthly tabernacle in order to be taken again.[2] The blood represents the spiritual and moral power that anoints man, and was a proof of the reality (1) of the Sacrifice of His death, (2) of His human nature, and (3) of His suffering, for He suffered in His own Person. His body, soul, and spirit—His total personality and

[1] See Westcott. 1 John i. 7.

[2] "Two distinctive ideas were included in the sacrifice of a victim—the death of the victim by the shedding of its blood, and the liberation, so to speak, of the principle of life by which it had been animated, so that this life became available for another end" (Westcott, "Epist. of St. John," notes 34, 35, 36). Again he says: "The blood of CHRIST represents CHRIST'S life—(1) as rendered in self-sacrifice to GOD for men; (2) as brought into perfect fellowship with GOD, having been set free by His death. The blood of CHRIST is, in short, the life of CHRIST given for men, and, as applied, the life of CHRIST now given to men."

self—were all convulsed with an agony of which His perfect sympathy with man was not the least painful element, "in the exhaustive obedience and surrender of His total self."[1] For as man is one organism, the Person of CHRIST was one which suffered in any part of His system which suffered. To think otherwise were to conceive an unnatural cleavage between the human organism and the Divine Personality of the Son of Man. And, fourthly, the blood is a sign of our participation in His Sacrifice, for "we glorify Him Who was sacrificed for us; we also sacrificing ourselves."[2]

One must also emphasise the fact that a true doctrine of the Atonement may not be based upon the interpretation of any one of the Greek prepositions *ὑπέρ*, *περί*, *διά* and *ἀντί*, to the exclusion of the others. These have been described by Primate Alexander as the preposition of protection, the preposition of real relation, the preposition of tenderness, the preposition of mysterious relation, and the preposition of substitution respectively. All together they combine to present an attractive picture of Him Who stands over (*ὑπέρ*) His fallen comrades and defends them like a Homeric warrior with His shield; Who casts His protecting arms around (*περί*) the helpless ones in peril; Who resigned His life with lamb-like patience for the sake of (*διά*) and on behalf of (*ἀντί*) those He loved, in order to set them free from the bondage in which they were held. And yet these prepositions are all rendered "for" in the Authorised Version. Indeed, we cannot express their meaning otherwise. For it is a patent fact that the Greek prepositions had lost nearly all their distinctive meaning in the days when the Gospels were written. It is significant, however, that St. Paul, who wrote with a more lively sense of the Greek idiom,

[1] Forsyth, "Cruciality of the Cross," p. 203.
[2] Clement of Alexandria, "Str.," vii. 836.

perhaps, than any other New Testament writer, never used *ἀντί* (*anti*=instead of), but always *ὑπέρ* (*huper*=on behalf of), in connection with the death of CHRIST; and that the expression *λύτρον ἀντί* (a ransom for) no more implies substitution than the stater of Matt. xvii. 24: "You will find a stater; that take and give *for* Me and thee" (*ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ*). Dalman, moreover, states that "Aramaic was the everyday speech of the Jewish people at this period, in so far, at least, as it was not Greek," and that JESUS grew up speaking the Aramaic tongue, and that He would be obliged to speak Aramaic to His disciples.[1] This, however, is not a settled point. But it surely makes it clear that it is upon the great ruling principles and ideas of our LORD'S teaching, life, and death, that the theory of His work is to be constructed. And even in those passages in St. John's Gospel which Wendt allows to belong to the original source,[2] there is a tremendous significance attached by the SAVIOUR to His own Death and Passion, which shows that that event, the consummation of His life-work, was charged with something more than moral power. In these discourses JESUS speaks of Himself as One Who can give new life, here and now, to His people, and Who can help them to conquer the evil in the world. This is the highest form of redemption. And it can be truly said with St. Paul that "He of GOD is made unto us redemption,"[3] in the sense that He was in Himself the principle of our deliverance, and that He accomplished it.

The doctrine of the Atonement is not, therefore, (1) to be based merely upon the interpretation of Greek prepositions. (2) Neither is it to be founded on the symbolism of Jewish rites and sacrifices, which had reality and meaning only in the light of the Atonement, and which the writer

[1] E. T., "The Words of Jesus," p. 7.
[2] *E.g.*, chap. xii. 23-31.
[3] 1 Cor. i. 3.

to the Hebrews contrasted unfavourably with the sacrifice offered by our High-Priest. (3) Nor yet is it to be constructed upon incorrect and imperfect views of the nature of GOD and man and of the nature and work of the SAVIOUR. It is from one or other of these methods that the least permanent and rational theories of Atonement have arisen, while many erroneous interpretations are due to the laying of all the emphasis, or an improper emphasis, upon some one aspect of the Atonement, or some one of the relations it is intended to express, to the neglect of other aspects and relations. And yet they have all in their day accomplished some good, because they have expressed some truth. The harm they have done is due to the neglect of "the proportion of the faith," and of the catholicity of the principles involved. Even in the strangest view of the patristic and medieval ages shone the glory and power of the Crucified. The essentials of the faith are independent of the errors of theologians.

The starting-point of the theologian generally strikes the dominant note of his doctrine. The genesis of Luther's theology lay in his awakened consciousness of sin and his need of forgiveness and reconciliation. Accordingly, we find his theories of Incarnation and Atonement constructed upon his own individual necessities. "It is not enough," he wrote, "that a man believes that GOD is, that CHRIST suffered, and suchlike; but he must steadfastly believe that GOD is GOD for his blessedness, that CHRIST suffered for him, died, was crucified, rose again, and that He bore his sins for him."[1] This personal interest led him to see the necessity of a personal appropriation of the Atonement as the very essence of faith.

Many, like him, approach the sacred mystery of GOD'S love and sacrifice from such a standpoint, and consider

[1] Cited in *Expositor*, September, 1903, p. 183.

what has been done for them rather than what they must do for GOD. And there is a sense in which the subject must be approached from a human point of view. Any theological statement of the Being of GOD, Incarnation or Atonement, that does not commend itself to the heart and reason of man, that is not approved by the inner witness of his spirit, is impotent and ineffectual in human life. The answer to human necessity, and the satisfaction of the human aspirations of the time—these are the tests of the doctrine of faith. A theory of forgiveness that represents it as a written decree handed down from the judgment-seat of Divine Love, proclaiming our pardon and immunity because another has paid the penalty, however potent for good it may have been in a less philosophical age, is not acceptable to modern reason. Pardon is not a judicial acquittal, a legal acquittance, but it is the inner satisfaction of the soul, imparting peace, realising holiness. A modern theory of justification must justify itself before the inner tribunal in man—his conscience, its requirements and satisfactions. There may, indeed, be a more excellent way of considering the relation of the Incarnation and Atonement to human life. We may start from a higher point—"GOD'S holy love, reconciling us to Himself in CHRIST." To think merely of our sinfulness and our need is to express the selfish principle, which is already sufficiently strong, and to deviate from the grand unselfishness of CHRIST. And yet the question "*Cui bono?*" seems so natural that this mode of approaching the subject is almost universal, and the doctrine is, accordingly, most effectually expressed in terms of men's need and gain rather than of GOD'S love and grace.

The egoistical motive gave rise to the conception of the Atonement as a deliverance from punishment, and to the idea of CHRIST as the substitute for man. But if physical death is one of the natural consequences of sin—although

it seems to be rather a natural necessity under present conditions of life, which may have been made so by sin, removing the older in order to make room for the younger generation—we are not delivered from it. And if penitence, remorse, shame, and humiliation be the spiritual consequences of sin in a good man's after-life, such as that of St. Augustine, we are not saved therefrom. Nay, they are the inner effects of saving grace. It is only when we are really and spiritually in CHRIST that we learn to pay the penalty for our sins—to give satisfaction. It is from sin itself that man is delivered—sin which is essentially the resistance of the human will to the Divine, and the refusal of the Divine love, a resistance and refusal which are, indeed, their own worst punishment, for they lead to that separation from the spiritual source of his being which means prolonged misery; and which can only be overcome and annihilated by perfect submission to the Divine Will and perfect response to the Divine Love, as they have been revealed in CHRIST, and are revealed in us as we are in Him, so that we, in Him and through Him, may enjoy the sweetness of union with GOD.

Nor is the Atonement external substitution. It is true that, apart from the use of the Greek *ἀντί* and the Mosaic sacrificial system, there are passages such as: "He hath made Him to be sin for us, Who knew no sin,"[1] and "He was made a curse for us,"[2] which seem to afford a *prima facie* case for substitution. But, at the same time, they cannot refer to an external transaction. For if we mean that CHRIST took upon Himself "the sins of men by some artificial substitution, we deny that He is their actual representative." Here Maurice sounded a true note.[3] It was as our representative that CHRIST bare our sins. He

[1] 2 Cor. v. 21.
[2] Gal. iii. 13. The Greek preposition in both instances is *ὑπέρ*.
[3] F. M. Maurice, "Theological Essays," Popular Edition, p. 37.

was our sponsor, not our substitute, the surety in Himself and us of the better covenant.[1] This is a truer relation than that conceived by men of old as existing between GOD and man. There was a mysterious union between the FATHER and the SON, and a no less mysterious relation between the Son of Man and the humanity He represented, with which the Scriptural relation of Adam to mankind bears no comparison, although it may serve to illustrate it very much in the same way as a ball of coloured glass might be used to represent the sun to children.[2]

Accordingly, the work of JESUS CHRIST for man cannot be conceived as in any way resembling, or be expressed in terms of, the substitution of one man for another. He is the Head—the real root of our race, the source of its righteousness, the immanent cause of its mysterious union as a Body—at once its sanctifying, unifying, and creative influence, for "all things were created by Him and for Him, and in Him all things consist."[3] All humanity is so summed up in Him, and He is so united with all humanity, not merely as the propagator of the element of righteousness, but as the fountain-head of its spiritual life, the sanctifier of its every effort and enthusiasm, that when He died to sin, all mankind died to sin, potentially, as in Him, so that "we thus judge that if one died for all, then all died."[4]

Owing to the poverty of language (*sermonis egestas*) there is no theological term that exactly describes the relation of CHRIST to the race, Who was the ripest product of human life, in Whom humanity found its truest expression, reached its highest truth, realised its utmost possibilities, solved the riddle of its existence, redeemed itself from sin, and reconciled itself to the will and

[1] Heb. vii. 22.
[2] See 1 Cor. xv. 22; Rom. v. 12-21.
[3] Col. i. 17.
[4] 2 Cor. v. 15.

holiness of GOD. It was a development of humanity which revealed the Divine within, it was a revelation of Deity which developed the human without. In one sense it was a recapitulation; in the other an identification. Such a relation is at once the basis of the necessity of living a godly life, and the source of the power so to live. It is the Spirit of CHRIST, Who quickens in man the principles of self-sacrifice and holiness, that helps man to realise that union with GOD in CHRIST which is man's atonement and GOD'S achievement.

Not only this mysterious relation, but the very *rationale* of punishment, militates against the view that what CHRIST suffered was vicarious punishment. The object is to correct and reform by a system that induces shame and penitence, which in His case were irrelevant. His sufferings, sorrows, and penitence were neither penal nor substitutionary, but were the expression and result of His realisation of His solidaric oneness with humanity in humanity, Who summed up humanity in Himself, apart from Whom humanity has no explanation, no purpose, no way of redemption or achievement. His sufferings, sorrows, and penitence are, therefore, no alien deposit, no foreign graft. Seeds sown in the field of humanity, they belong to the race, and are ours in *posse* so far as we are human, and in *esse* so far as we are CHRIST'S.

The earlier and later Calvinists, starting respectively from the absolute and rectoral justice of GOD, equally failed in grasping the relations that underlay Atonement, in their effort to comprehend the facts it expressed. The leading principle of the earlier Calvinists, Dr. Owen and President Edwards, was the Divine justice of GOD in its absolute form, which must, by an eternal necessity of the Divine Nature, distribute eternal misery to sin and eternal blessedness to righteousness. This led to the view that this punishment, or its equivalent in suffering, was borne

by CHRIST, but only for the elect.[1] It was, as Owen wrote, "a full, valuable compensation for all the sins of all those for whom He made satisfaction by undergoing that same punishment, which, by reason of the obligation that was upon them, they themselves were bound to undergo."[2] This was supplemented by the doctrine of imputation.

The later Calvinists proceed from the idea of GOD as a moral governor of the universe, Who must satisfy the claims of public or rectoral justice. Dr. Wardlaw, quoting from Dr. Alexander, says: "In its simplest form the problem of religion may be expressed thus: Given a supreme duty, the Creator and Governor of all things, and an intelligent creature in a state of alienation and estrangement from His Creator; to determine the means whereby a reconciliation may be effected, and the creature restored to the favour and service of GOD. . . . The problem to be solved is this: How may this be accomplished honourably to the character and government of the Supreme Ruler?"[3] It is little wonder that the great mystery of faith is reduced to the nature of an expedient by this method of approaching it. "Atonement," writes Dr. Jenkyn, "is an expedient substituted in the place of the literal infliction of the penalty, so as to supply the government just and good ground for dispensing favour to the offender."[4]

While this newer school rejects the doctrine of imputation, its treatment of the whole subject is distinctly legal. The system of legalism into which Judaism had developed was condemned by CHRIST, Who revealed GOD, not as a

[1] "For to affirm CHRIST to die for all men is the readiest way to prove He died for no man in the sense Christians have hitherto believed, and to hurry poor souls into the bottom of Socinian blasphemies" (quoted by McLeod Campbell, "Atonement," p. 67).

[2] "Atonement," p. 48.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 78.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

lawgiver, but as a FATHER, with Whom our relations are not forensic, but filial; nor legal or external, but inward, moral, and spiritual.[1] The GOD CHRIST revealed is not the sovereign of His subjects, but the FATHER of His children; does not exact the uttermost farthing or graduate them to eternal punishment, but wins them by the discipline of love and purity to a higher life. Calvinism fails to do justice to the Fatherhood of GOD, with which the bare legality of an external transaction may not be associated, and in the light of which grace is not a sovereign's favour, but a FATHER'S free gift. Calvinism is inconsistent with the philosophy of the kingdom of Heaven, in which this newer order of things is expressed, this more intimate relation of the FATHER and the child is realised. The problem of that kingdom is not the reconciliation of GOD'S forgiveness with the claims of justice or government, but the restoration of the child to the FATHER'S Will, and Love, Heart, and Home.

And yet Calvinism expresses one fundamental truth—that there must be some righteousness which is ours and yet not ours; a holiness of GOD which gives an objective ideal and standard and hope of the righteousness of man, which becomes subjective—that is, becomes ours by assimilation, by that organic growth of the individual into the spiritual life of CHRIST which is the result of the energising of the SPIRIT. And yet the righteousness of CHRIST is not wholly external to the race with which He identified Himself. Were it altogether without us, it would never be within us. It may be likened unto a spiritual reservoir in humanity, from which the moral and spiritual springs of humanity are supplied by the Divine SPIRIT as He quickens it into life in us, and as He develops within us the righteous character of CHRIST,

[1] Matt., chaps. v.-vii.; Luke xi. 38-54; John v. 17 *et seq.*, viii. 31-59, xii. 49 *et seq.*, xvii.

which is ours so far as we identify ourselves with Him Who identifies Himself with us. Thus our identification with CHRIST, the federal Head of the race, Whose righteousness becomes ours by being stirred into life within us, is consummated by the Spirit of CHRIST, who enables us one by one to say, "I have been crucified with CHRIST, yet I live; and yet no longer I, but CHRIST liveth in me."[1] This is why "the last Adam" is represented as developing into "a quickening Spirit,"[2] Who reconstitutes our personality by developing within us a new *ego*—which is, however, not new—after the renunciation of the old.

This antithesis found its reconciliation in Him Who makes the objective subjective, by transmuting an external fact into an internal power, and helps us to realise subjectively that which without such realisation would have no existence for us—the Atonement of CHRIST. Dr. Du Bose says: "All the reality in the universe can be no Gospel for me as long as it remains objective, or until it enters into living relations to ourselves." It is in union with CHRIST that the personal subjective life of the believer rises into consciousness, and the Sacrifice consecrated on Calvary is consummated in the Christian's conscience. The personal identity is maintained all through. If CHRIST is in him,[3] he is also a "man in CHRIST."[4] The substitution of the Divine Personality for the human—a fallacy which mars Dr. Moberley's fine work—is quite as unphilosophical as the substitution of the CHRIST for us. There must be some objective ground for apprehension, appropriation, belief, and love. But, on the other hand, the philosopher will plead for personality. The Sacrifice of Calvary does not in itself establish a relation between him and the Atonement. An historical

[1] Gal. ii. 20.
[2] 1 Cor. xv. 45 : ἐγένετο εἰς.
[3] Col. i. 27.
[4] 2 Cor. xii. 2.

fact cannot alter his life unless it has power to become part of his personal experience or has touched his life at some vital point.[1] The sacrifice offered objectively must be realised subjectively. It must be expressed in terms of consciousness if it is to effect an inner change of that consciousness. The ultimate reality for him is that which he has appropriated, assimilated, and made his own. If the Atonement is to be the ultimate reality for him, it must be capable of such assimilation. Our LORD appealed to love—"Lovest thou Me?"—and love assimilates, or is a subjective realisation of the character of its object. The subjective aspect is, therefore, the correlative of the objective. They are inseparable as the inside and outside of a shield, and neither to be neglected if the doctrine is to be represented in its true perspective and proportions, as it has not been by those theories that are exclusively one or the other.

The extreme objective view leads to a transactional Atonement, the extreme subjective to a self-wrought Atonement. The former is mechanical, the latter egotistical; whereas we can neither achieve our own Atonement nor contemplate it. Neither Calvary nor conscience are sufficient in themselves to constitute Atonement. The Atonement as a revelation of holiness compels love. It it could not operate as a motive, it were in vain; but unless it has a point of attachment in the experience of man, it would fail to possess just that uplifting and transforming power the Master claimed to be. "And I, if I be lifted up, shall draw all men unto Myself." The Cross is the very pivot of Christian experience, because it is the victory over that which had brought sorrow and trouble, not only upon the race at large, but upon each individual in his turn.

It is well, therefore, to lay stress upon the objective

[1] "Atonement and Personality," chap. ix., p. 253.

aspect of the Atonement, frequently overlooked by those who develop the doctrine on the moral side, but which has found worthy exponents in Drs. Dale and Denney.[1] For the Atonement is not merely a subjective influence—a moral appeal and incentive; it is an objective fact, as the Incarnation was, as evil is. It is both objective, in giving a leverage, a fulcrum, a *πού στῶ*, to Christianity; and subjective, as supplying a motive and working upon the moral nature of man by example and influence. A revelation of Divine love and goodness would do the latter, but something more than a revelation is required for the former. Our creeds are, indeed, revelations, but they are based upon the facts of GOD, Incarnation, and Atonement.

And the Cross is not a revelation unless it be a redemption. A revelation of righteous love which does not deal actively with sin, in the way of condemning, overcoming, and annihilating it, would not redeem us or save us from its power. The ordinary man requires something more than even the exhibition of the love of GOD in the CHRIST, or the perfect example of self-sacrifice, or the moral appeal of CHRIST'S righteousness, or the sublime ethical effect of the Cross. There must be something to *grip* him—something to make him feel at once his sinfulness and his dependence. There must be something actual and real to reach him; something acted out in life and death to touch him; some new power to give him the grace of repentance and to save him from sin; something to cling to.

And there was some mysterious effect of this Cross and Passion not conceivable by, but not incommunicable to, us, something that went deeper to the heart of the matter than example, obedience or self-sacrifice. Butler held

[1] See "Death of Christ: Atonement and the Modern Mind," *Expositor*, October, 1903, p. 256.

that there was something objective in the Atonement. He writes: "By the general prevalence of propitiatory sacrifice over the heathen world, this notion of repentance alone being sufficient to expiate guilt appears to be contrary to the general sense of mankind."[1] For sacrifice expressed the need felt by the human soul for some ground of religious confidence, assurance, and hope external to itself. There was something in the Atonement, even if it, as a sacrifice, stands, as it surely does, in a class by itself, that supplied that assurance which a subjective religion cannot give. The prayer theory of sacrifice is inadequate to explain the needs and aspirations of the human soul, because it grounds the sinner's worthiness upon the work of his own feelings.[2] The same subjectivity, or independence of external authority and facts, has frequently led to an indifference to the sanctions of religion.[3] Subjectivity is at once the strength and weakness of the Ritschlian theology. Ritschl admitted the perfect revelation of the FATHER'S grace and truth in CHRIST, and also His inward supremacy over the world.[4] But when asked to account for the Personality of CHRIST, Ritschl says: "How the person of CHRIST became that which it is for the moral and religious consciousness, is no proper subject for theological investigation, for the problem stretches far beyond the limits of any possible investigation of whatever kind."[5] And Harnack replies: "That is His secret." In a word, CHRIST exists for faith, not for reason, while JESUS was historical. The subject is then made the real test of reality and work. Subjective representations and value judgments take the place of objective reality. CHRIST has no objective Godhead, but He has the

[1] "Analogy," ii., c. v.
[2] See Art. "Sacrifice," Hastings, "Dictionary of the Bible," p. 341.
[3] See Professor Orr, *Expositor*, January, 1910.
[4] Edgehill, "Faith and Fact," p. 192.
[5] "Justification and Reconciliation," iii. 426.

religious value of a GOD for faith. This is Ritschl's explanation of the influence of CHRIST. Surely a unique, sinless, solitary, perfect Being, Who reveals the FATHER, and conquers sin in His own self, requires a more satisfactory explanation. This is the result of ignoring the objective in the revelation and Life of CHRIST.

"The moral influence theory," which is believed to remove so many difficulties in the conception of the Atonement, likewise fails to predicate a rational and ethical basis for the inner change of life effected by the preaching of the Cross. And yet there was here a Divine achievement. As the writer to the Hebrews says of Him: "Having *achieved* the purification of our sins"[1] and "*having found* æonian redemption."[2] St. Paul writes: "GOD, having sent His own SON, . . . *condemned* sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the SPIRIT";[3] "He sent Him forth as a propitiatory . . . with a view to show forth His own righteousness,"[4] recognising both the objective historic fact as well as its subjective moral effect. For attachment to the Divine Personality of CHRIST and faith in His Atonement must manifest itself in a crucifixion of the flesh, with its passions and lusts, and issue in a new spiritual life of grace.[5]

There was an intrinsic efficacy in the Cross. It was not merely an episode, a crowning withal of a beautiful life of unselfishness in time; the motive and ideal of the holiest human life: it was the climax and explanation of the Incarnate life; it was the revelation of an eternal Atonement of "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,"[6] of a GOD Who suffered in the sufferings of His creatures; it was the manifestation of the principle of

[1] Heb. i. 3: *ποιησάμενος.*
[2] Heb. ix. 12: *εὑράμενος.*
[3] Rom. viii. 3.
[4] Rom. iii. 25.
[5] Gal. v. 25.
[6] Rev. xiii. 8.

righteousness which had ever been in contact with the sin-problem, subduing its power and purifying its servants, now victorious and triumphant even in the hour of seeming defeat, which was but the birth-pang of the new, risen, spiritual life, into which the SPIRIT of Him that raised up JESUS from the dead doth lead the sons of men as sons of GOD.[1] Herein lay the moral dynamic of the Cross. The objective element was not a change made in GOD's relation or attitude to man; but a change made in man's spiritual status in the universe, as he is potentially forgiven, redeemed, and reconciled to and by GOD-in-CHRIST. There is a wrath of GOD against sin. That wrath was turned against sin in an actual purification of humanity from sin. Regarded thus, there was a self-propitiation of Deity in CHRIST, Who, in one sense, bare our sins, and in another condemned it. Enduring the malicious opposition of those who rewarded His love and righteousness with hatred and death, He gathered up in Himself, as the Head and Representative of the race, the utter and malignant evil of mankind which concentrated itself—came to a head, as it were—in its conflict with Him, and subdued it by bearing it and bearing its punishment, for the sinfulness of man is the punishment of his sin.

And sin, doing its worst against the Sinless One, the Representative of GOD, in the person of His enemies, was revealed in all its baseness, horror, evil and powerlessness. For He was obedient unto death, in death, and through death, and by the beautiful spirit in which He bore it, He revealed the state of degradation to which the malice of sin had brought His foes, and not only achieved a moral victory over their hatred, falsehood, cruelty, impurity and blasphemy, and showed how men may win such a victory —"Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world"[2]— but also weakened the power which but for Him would

[1] Rom. viii. 11, 15. [2] John xvi. 33.

have overwhelmed our race. In Him the flesh—our flesh—died to sin; in Him sin—our sin—is dead. In Him the principle of selfishness—our selfishness, with its passions and lusts—was crucified. In Him humanity—our humanity—rose from the dead.

This was the spiritual and æonian principle of the Cross. Therefore it means forgiveness, because sin was met there and vanquished. Therefore it means life, because death was mastered by Him Who could not "be holden of"[1] that death which found its consummation in the "Resurrection and the Life."

The tendency of the present age is to reject the objective[2] side of the Atonement which was so prominent in the theology of the last century, because of the judicial and legal aspect in which it was then presented. The logical conclusion of an undue emphasis of the objective nature of the Atonement in relation to GOD is a conflict between the Divine justice in the FATHER and the Divine mercy in the SON, which is contrary to Scripture and creed. The SON'S will was in perfect harmony with the FATHER'S. His life was a perfect exhibition of the will of the FATHER, in doing and suffering. "If we would adhere to the faith once delivered to the saints, we must not dare to speak of CHRIST as changing that will which He took flesh and died to fulfil," wrote Maurice. This is our "fundamental maxim." If we wish to conform to the revelation of the FATHER'S love given by the SON—"GOD so loved the world that He gave His Only-Begotten SON"—we may not speak or think of Atonement as necessary to propitiate the FATHER, that is, to make Him gracious and forgiving, and turn His Heart, which went forth—in the SON'S parable—spontaneously in love and pity and forgiveness to meet and bring home the prodigal son. The SON'S offering of a sinless life and a voluntary death was the

[1] Acts ii. 24. [2] "Theological Essays" (Maurice), vii.

outcome of His own love, which required and welcomed pain—not as penalty, but as the only language possible through which it could make its purpose known and felt. But that offering and that death were the means of the realisation of the FATHER'S purpose, because they led to that Resurrection which signalised the triumph of righteousness and love over sin and hate. "Therefore doth My FATHER love Me, because I lay down (or stake) My life that I may take it again."[1] "For GOD was in CHRIST reconciling the world unto Himself."[2] And consequently *the Atonement was not the cause but the effect of the* FATHER'S *love*. This perfect union and harmony of will and purpose between the FATHER and the SON will be the subject of another chapter.

Another error into which an exaggeration of the objective aspect leads is that of "a forensic fiction": the idea that a transaction consummated outside the human personality can redeem that personality within which the evil is. And this caused men to seek the rationale of the Atonement in the relations of CHRIST to the FATHER, Whom He is said to have propitiated; to the law of righteousness, whose every demand He is said to have satisfied; and even to Satan, from whom He is said to have redeemed us.

The death of CHRIST, which universal sentiment puts in a category by itself, had and has an intrinsic value of its own by reason of the Divine Nature of Him Who passed through it, not that we regard that Divine Nature as giving Him the power to sustain infinite penal suffering,[3] or as giving an infinite value to any penal suffering He endured, but as giving an infinite importance and a cosmic significance to the Passion and Death of the Son of Man. His Death had an objective reality, not that He bore the

[1] John x. 17. [2] 2 Cor. v. 19.
[3] Older and later Calvinists.

penalty of the sins of the elect, as a "full and valuable compensation made to the justice of GOD"[1]; not that His suffering was an equivalent satisfaction to the claims of GOD'S moral government of the world[2]; not that He was treated as sin by GOD,[3] and abandoned by Him; but because it was a triumph over the principle of self; because it was not only a sublime self-sacrifice, but a unique victory over evil.[4] It was a public condemnation of sin in humanity, and a confession of GOD'S holiness because of His perfect union with the FATHER and complete identity with the holiness that condemned sin. It was therefore, as Dr. Moberly expresses it, a vicarious penitence, perfect in its kind. But it was not even this unless it was more. The Cross was the revelation of the Divine Mind in humanity in its attitude of wrath to sin and love to the sinner. It was also a real overcoming of the dread of death and the power of evil, a real attack and conquest of the principle of self; a real inauguration of the kingdom of the spirit of love and obedience. The spiritual principle lay, not only in its sinless penitence and its perfect obedience, but also in its victory over sin and self.

Seeing, then, that there is an objective Atonement, which is the logical antecedent of its subjective realisation, and is primarily an historical fact outside and beyond our experience, we must endeavour to survey it from a standpoint outside our experience, which does not explain it, although it may present possible points of attachment. Regarded from such a standpoint, the Atonement assumes a vaster importance in the moral order of GOD; in the spiritual life of the Deity. To us, from our standpoint, it is a unique phenomenon, an unclassifiable process. But to one who could transcend the limits of human experience, and survey the whole sum of things and sweep

[1] Owen.
[2] Later Calvinists.
[3] Luther.
[4] Heb. ii. 14.

of life as GOD sees it, it might be quite a normal expression of His energy, love, and will. For we may not suppose that GOD is confined to one realised possibility, such as human experience; or to one activity—life as we know it. There is, however, a Divine something with which every such possibility must harmonise if it is to be realised—the Divine Purpose or Idea, the "one far-off Divine event." Has the Atonement the potent energy necessary to help forward that movement, to assist in the realisation of that Idea which had been obstructed in its development; to galvanise with new force the ineffectual life of humanity, and so enable it to work out its own salvation, GOD energising therein, both to will and work for His good pleasure?[1] If so, the Atonement process is related to every other Divine process known and unknown to man in one great Unity—the Eternal Thought of GOD.

The Divine SPIRIT taught the disciples to contemplate their Master *sub specie eternitatis* in His relation to GOD. Thus they were led to the Eternal and Divine Personality of the SON of GOD, the Word of GOD. The same Spirit taught them to see in the Atonement, GOD in CHRIST reconciling the world unto Himself. This was the grandest theory of Atonement, transcending all human experience in its height and sublimity, and raising man to the platform of GOD. To survey a transcendent fact or process from such a platform is to see it acting upon man's experience as a part of one coherent, universal whole, one great and all-inclusive Unity. Whereas, if we examine such in the light of human experience, seeking for human tests, standards, and analogies, we would be measuring the straight line by the crooked, the Divine canon by the carpenter's rule. This is the explanation of the general obscurity of the doctrine of Atonement. Men have darkened by their own counsel what is light in GOD. The

[1] Phil. ii. 13.

technicalities of human law rested as an incubus upon the simplicity of Divine revelation. The very splendour of the truth has been hidden by the cloud of controversy over such theological terms as substitution, imputation, satisfaction, and propitiation. This is why Maurice[1] begins from GOD. He grounds all theology upon the Triune Personality of GOD. This is the Scriptural method. "There everything proceeds from GOD; He is revealing Himself; He is acting, speaking, ruling." Accordingly, he bases all human morality upon the original relation in which man stands to GOD.

The true starting-point of the theologian is, accordingly, the Divine—GOD as He thinks and wills and loves. "From Him is every beginning, all things are full of GOD," as the Roman poet[2] sang. In the Scriptures it is GOD Who gives, Who suffers, Who pardons, Who reconciles. JESUS sends us back to GOD—"Holy Father," "Righteous Father";[3] "GOD so loved the world"; "Ye shall be perfect, as your Father in Heaven is perfect." What GOD required to be expressed and realised in humanity was the Holiness[4] of the Divine Love. The fundamental notion of such holiness in the Old Testament is the unapproachableness, personal aloofness, and moral transcendence of Deity. In the New Testament it stands for the energising of the Immanent GOD in human life, sanctifying its every impulse, hallowing its every enterprise, so that men should share His holiness[5] and become partakers of His Divine Nature.[6] It is not a passivity, but an activity. It is a self-realisation of the Divine Character in human life.

The background of this Divine activity in human life is

[1] "Doctrine of Sacrifice," xli.
[2] Virgil, "Eclog.," iii. 60: "Ab Jove principium, musæ; Jovis omnia plena."
[3] John xvii. 11, 25; Matt. v. 48.
[4] ἁγιωσύνη (state), ἁγιότης (quality), ἁγιασμός (process).
[5] Heb. xii. 10.
[6] 2 Pet. i. 4.

love. "All the Divine attributes are combined in love, as in their centre and vital principle. Wisdom is its intelligence; might its productivity; the entire natural creation and the entire revelation of righteousness are means by which it attains its theological aims."[1] Righteousness, according to Ritschl, is GOD'S consistency in carrying out His purposes of love.[2]

The love of GOD has, consequently, an ethical character, as His holiness has an ethical ground. His holiness expresses His responsibility to the law of His own spiritual life which He fulfils in us; for holiness belongs to Him pre-eminently, and to humanity as it is in GOD. It is no retributive or forensic element in the Divine nature, although it may be conceived as destructive of sin, as it is creative of righteousness. This negative or hostile aspect might be described as "wrath." But its purpose is not punishment, but salvation; while His love denotes His sense of the Divine responsibility to His Creation, particularly man, which goes forth in self-sacrifice, expresses itself in self-giving, realises itself in union. There is nothing weakly sentimental in this idea of Divine love. It can be conceived as sternly severe in the vindication of its rights, in the assertion of its claims, in the development of its purposes, in the working for unity. GOD'S love is GOD as He gives Himself to man; GOD'S holiness is GOD as He claims man for Himself. Love is the source of creation and redemption; holiness is the final cause and purpose which is realised therein. All things are from GOD; all things are for GOD. For if He is the Beginning, He also is the End. The starting-point must, therefore, be the holy love of GOD that must do justice to itself, requires a conspicuous illustration (ἔνδειξις),[3]

[1] Martineau quoted in art. "Love," Hastings, "Dictionary of the Bible," p. 154.

[2] "Justification and Reconciliation," ii. 103-113.

[3] Rom. iii. 25: *εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ.*

and demands a sphere for self-expression and development. GOD must be true to Himself. He cannot deny Himself. The moral law which is the law of His life must be asserted in the life of humanity.

Still less can He deny His heart of love. The theory of Anselm owes whatever vitality and power it possesses to its assertion of the honour of GOD and the righteousness that is His due. But Athanasius perceived that it was due to GOD's own self-consistency[1] to maintain His own law, and at the same time due to His loving purpose for men,[2] to save them from a ruin by which it would be *unseemly* for Him to allow them to perish utterly.[3] And he declares that this was done by the Word of GOD indwelling in humanity. What a holy GOD requires is the confession of His holiness and of the sin that separates. Who but the Divine Word could confess His holiness? Who but the Holy One could realise sin? What a GOD of love desires is that His children should be saved from sin and restored to union with Him. Who but the SON of GOD could enter into humanity, and by His incorporation with it purify the very fountain of its being, and enable it to share in His incorruption by reason of its organic union with Himself?

Thus, beginning from the holy love of GOD, we understand the nature of the satisfaction He requires. Being ethical and spiritual, it cannot be expressed in terms of punishment or suffering, nor would it attain its purpose, or realise itself, in a vicarious transaction in which humanity played no part.

But if there was in the Cross such a re-establishment

[1] "De Incarn.," vii. : *τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων εὔλογον ἀποσῶσαι πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα.*

[2] *κατὰ φιλανθρωπίαν καὶ ἀγαθότητα τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ Πατρὸς* (*ibid.*) *τῇ εἰς ἡμᾶς αὐτοῦ φιλανθρωπίᾳ* (*ibid.*) ; *cf. φιλανθρώπως ποιῶν* (*ibid.*).

[3] *Ibid.*, vi. : "It would be unseemly (*ἀπρεπὲς δὲ ἦν*) that what GOD made capable of sharing, and actually sharing, the Logos should perish."

of the principle of the holiness of GOD which committed the believer to holiness of life; if there was such a hallowing of the FATHER'S Name in the SON'S life, and that supreme Act which consummated that life, as was only possible under such conditions; if there was such a justification and confession of GOD by an act of cosmic significance which asserted His righteousness as a world-conquering principle, and His love as a world-saving principle, which condemned sin in the flesh and revealed the FATHER'S love in the suffering of His SON, the Cross would be the meeting-place of the holy love of the FATHER and the equally holy love of the SON, each responding to each, each consummated by each, in the great work of man's atonement. It was GOD-in-CHRIST going out of Himself to realise Himself — to be conscious of Himself as love and holiness. It was the indwelling CHRIST-in-man realising the Divine Idea and Will in humanity so perfectly as regards GOD, so intimately as regards man, that the energy that emanated from Him charged the atmosphere of man's life with a Divine force, creating a new environment, so that man can realise the possibilities of his life as a man *in* CHRIST.

In that death of self-sacrifice in which the "organic pragmatism and moral unity" of His whole life and character found expression, and which, because of the indwelling Word of GOD, involved a resurrection and ascension to a life of enlarged influence and spiritual power, and a new spiritual endowment of, and vital union with, humanity,[1] the Holy FATHER might be conceived

[1] Athanasius, "De Incarn.," chap. ix.: "For this purpose the Logos took unto Himself the body capable of death, in order that this body, by virtue of its conjunction with the all-controlling Logos, might make His death a death for all; and by reason of the indwelling Logos might remain incorruptible all through, and also might exempt all from corruption by the grace of its resurrection."

as seeing the means for the fulfilment of His Divine and loving purpose for man—a new channel by which the Divine life of the SPIRIT might be reproduced in man, and so finding satisfaction in His own self-realisation in the Person and work of the Only-Begotten SON—"This is My beloved SON, in Whom I am well pleased"—by which He transmitted His holiness and love to His children, who are enabled thereby to respond to His will, and to find in Him the consummation of their being.

In the same way, we have the ultimate satisfaction of our soul-hunger in that union with GOD-in-CHRIST in which we are empowered to realise the purpose and possibility of our life, in which realisation of ourselves in GOD He fulfils Himself and we are filled with Him. And this because "there is something in the soul which is so akin to GOD that it is one with Him, and not merely united with Him."[1]

The response the SAVIOUR made to the holiness and love of GOD is our Atonement. By His sublime confession of the holiness of GOD, by His unique revelation of the love of GOD, He achieved a splendid moral and spiritual victory, vindicating for all time the supremacy of the Divine characteristics of love and self-sacrifice over selfishness and self-gratification, and calling His people to enter into His trial and His triumph. "In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world."[2] This response was vicarious in the sense that but for Him it would never have been made; victorious in the sense that through Him and in Him humanity was committed to, and enabled to make, a similar response.

Was it perfect? Could a perfect response be made in humanity to the Holiness and Love of GOD?

In the first place, consider what the response was in

[1] ckhardt. [2] John xvi. 33.

itself. Summed up in one phrase, it was the realisation of sonship, or the ideal filial relation of man to GOD in humanity, which was a fulfilment of the true life of humanity, a realisation and fulfilment which, in manner and process, were affected by sin and death, but which are not to be considered as altogether determined by them, for they would have been necessary in a world in which sin and death were not. As both Ruprecht of Deutz and Duns Scotus asserted in the Middle Ages, an Incarnation would have taken place in fulfilment of the Divine purpose of the creation of the race,[1] of which the predestined manhood of the Eternal SON was the archetype. And the filial relation of man to his Maker, latent in the original constitution of human nature, would still require to be made a patent fact in human experience, even untainted by sin, by the revelation of a GOD indwelling in and manifesting Himself in human life, and teaching men to realise their relation to the FATHER through their relation to Himself. The facts of sin and death, which demanded redemption, of necessity altered the form in which such a revelation was made, and caused the very realisation of His own Sonship, and consequently of the true life of humanity as it is in GOD, to be made a matter of stress and strain for the SON Himself, and a matter of impossibility for mankind apart from Him and His Spirit. It is this inner conflict that explains the sorrows of the Man of Sorrows. He had lost none of those ties the loss of which makes life unendurable to man; and yet He was inexpressibly sad. Disappointment, misunderstanding, and rejection could not, apparently, affect One still in the full vigour of His life to such a degree. There was more beneath than appears on the surface. It was the realisation of Sonship in the FATHER, not only in an environ-

[1] See "Commentary on St. Matthew," xiii. (Ruprecht of Deutz); "In Sent. Pet. Lomb.," iii. 3 (Duns Scotus).

ment that sin had corrupted and evil had sealed as its own, but also in and through a death which was the inevitable sequel of His mission and the grand consummation of His testimony.

The philosophical objections that have been urged against the moral perfection of our LORD may be answered by considering His human life from the standpoint of a perfect realisation of such a relation, which was for Him and for us the realisation of the true life of man. It was such a realisation in a life normal, and yet ideal, in a life subject to the same moral order, and yet transcending all past human attainment to such a degree that it itself became the object of human aspiration, and caused the unbeliever Rousseau to exclaim: "If Socrates lived and died like a philosopher, JESUS CHRIST lived and died like a GOD." That was the basis of His filial consciousness, which can be judged by no higher standard than His own. What can only be remotely attained by the gradual development of humanity on the lines of His moral and spiritual life; what can only be distantly achieved through the progressive reproduction of His Spirit in humanity was realised by Him in His own miraculous and supernatural life, which revealed undreamt-of possibilities in humanity, and consummated by His Perfection that humanity which without it would have been imperfect. The question of the limitation which an imperfect environment, as the late Mr. T. H. Green points out in his "Prolegomena,"[1] of necessity presents to the full realisation of one's capacities, or the adequate reproduction of the Divine Mind in the human soul, does not arise, provided that, in this one respect, the purpose of His

[1] "Any life which the individual can possibly live is at best so limited by the necessities of his position that it seems impossible, on supposition that a Divine self-realising principle is at work in it, that it should be an adequate expression of such a principle" (p. 192).

Incarnation and the purpose of the creation of humanity, there was an adequate response of the human spirit in His case to the FATHER, an adequate realisation of the filial relationship to GOD. Again, while ethical perfection is to be considered in relation to the particular environment in which one has to live, man in his spiritual and moral capacity is less the creature than the creator of his environment. This principle was notably exhibited in our LORD'S manner of attracting and repelling men. That His environment, divinely prepared, as we believe, by its world-wide language, empire, and expectation for the Gospel of a Universal SAVIOUR, was adapted to the development of the highest type of character is proved by the fact that He fulfilled every demand it made upon His soul in such a way that higher has not appeared and cannot be conceived.

And with regard to the fact that evolution, which is not necessarily opposed to Theism,[1] appears to be opposed to the realisation of a perfect ethical ideal in CHRIST, it is to be observed that the progress of humanity in every other domain—art, letters, military science, philosophy, etc.—has been as much dependent on the sudden appearance of transcendent personalities as on the slow attainment of gradually developing ideals by a gradually evolving race. The most momentous epochs of historical advance are marked by movements led by personalities, as well as by creative ideas, but such do not break the line of continuity with the past, but in their very recapitulation of it form fresh starting-points for a larger life. Why should not this be true of spiritual life in its fundamental aspect of realisation of the filial relationship to GOD "the Father of

[1] It does not require the relation between the Creator and His Creation to be more immanent and vital than was previously imagined, but it exhibits more adequately than the doctrine of special creation the world as the product of a self-revealing Will and Reason, and not of mechanical or casual causation.

spirits"? Is it an *a priori* impossibility to have One in Whom the spiritual history of the past was summed up, and the spiritual history of the future in this special aspect was contained? At all events, it is not now an *a posteriori* impossibility.

Objection is also made to our LORD'S sinlessness, on the philosophical ground that evil is necessary to the development of a perfect moral character.[1] According to Hegel, evil is a factor in the process of becoming good, which is discarded when the state of being good is reached. Hate could then be a moment in the development of love, and impurity a moment in the development of purity, if it were a question of moral practice and not of dialectics. But it is evident that there is a confusion here between the *recognition* of a virtue and its *realisation*. For the intellectual process it may be essential to proceed from sin to virtue, but our LORD was not concerned to attain a correct logical and philosophical conception and apprehension of virtue, but to manifest through all His trials and temptations a relationship to the holy, loving FATHER, which was perfect in its confidence, its love, and its devotion; and in which His own spiritual life advanced, because it was not a mere economical relation, but a relation essential to His very life, and as such was the inspiration of His own obedience, the standard of His own perfection, the source of His own peace. As He realised that holy Fatherhood in His own soul, He revealed that FATHER in His own character. Because He lived in harmony with GOD, His human life was perfectly symmetrical in its every relation, its every aspect. And we may surely say that a perfect response was made in humanity to the holiness and love of GOD by CHRIST. The bearing of His life and Personality upon sin, righteousness, and judgment is brought home to man

[1] Hegel, "Philosophy of Religion, iii. 33-100.

by the teaching of the Paraclete, which issues in a real condemnation of the sin of unbelief in CHRIST; a real manifestation of righteousness in the perfect harmony of the SON'S Will with the FATHER'S; a real act of judgment on "the prince of this world-order."

This vicarious penitence, this perfect Amen in humanity to the Will of GOD and His condemnation of sin, may well have been "the most poignant of all the pangs of the Divine Sufferer on Calvary."[1] It was due, on the one hand, to His perfect realisation of the relationship of the FATHER to humanity, and to His consequent identification of Himself as the SON of GOD with the FATHER'S disapproval of sin; and, on the other, to His organic relationship to the race of man, and to His consequent identification as the Son of Man with the sorrows and problems of the race. Others go farther, and say with Luther[2] that He identified Himself with the sin of man; and with Dale, that He endured penal suffering instead of inflicting it.[3] "Eternal punishment" is "eternal sin," and as such could not be endured by the Sinless One.[4] Nor could the remorse and unhappiness of a conscience of sin be compatible with the perfect inner peace of His spiritual life. Nevertheless, He identified Himself so completely with our nature, was so exposed to temptation and suffering, and was so much opposed by the sinful will and selfish heart of man, that, by reason of His organic union with our race, He felt the effects of an evil conscience in a way we cannot understand, and was affected by every moral hindrance to the development of the race in realisation of its relationship to the FATHER. He endured the separating force of sin, and atoned for its

[1] Canon Sanday, "Life of Christ in Recent Research," p. 290.
[2] "Epistle to Galatians," iii. 13.
[3] "The Atonement," p. lxvi. "Lect.," ix., pp. 392 *et seq.*
[4] Mark iii. 29: "Guilty of an eternal sin" (ἁμαρτήματος, W.H.R.; *v.l.* κρίσεως.

infringement of the FATHER's law by His Divine love and His obedience unto death. Thus He can meet the soul in the horrors of remorse by reason of His perfect sympathy, and He appropriates him and lives in him, empowering him by means of His indwelling SPIRIT to overcome sin by presenting the sacrifice of a redeemed and regenerated self. In this process the sin in the man becomes absorbed by the invincible principle of righteousness in the CHRIST, and the sinner finds pardon and peace.

The death of CHRIST was the triumph of the highest expression of love—self-sacrifice. It was the crowning service of the Son of Man, Who came not to be served, but to serve. There was no note of disaster or touch of disgrace in it from the standpoint of St. John. There was no penalty in this great act of self-surrender, but it was a perfect offering of a blameless life in which all men were generically included. And as the culmination of a Divine life lived most humanly and most holily, it was the beginning of a new life — the life of a sanctified humanity, the Body of CHRIST.

As Athanasius showed,[1] we may not regard the death of CHRIST apart from the birth of a new humanity. The self-sacrifice of the Master is quickened in His people by the SPIRIT. A new motive, love—"the love of CHRIST constraineth us";[2] a new inspiration, the all-attracting ideal and example of CHRIST—"And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Myself";[3] a new power, the spirit of self-sacrifice, entered our humanity from the Cross of CHRIST. In five different ways that Cross and Passion proved an eternal boon to humanity—(1) by His suffering He transformed the nature of suffering into a Divine discipline; (2) by His dying He redeemed our self-respect

[1] "For being the Word of the FATHER and supreme over all, He was able consequently, and He alone, to re-create all things, ἀνακτίσαι τὰ ὅλα" ("De Incarn.," vii.).

[2] 2 Cor. v. 14.

[3] John xii. 32.

in the presence of death, removing its shame and terror from those who trust in GOD, and making it an act of obedience to the Divine Will; (3) by His rising He made death the entrance to a higher and a fuller life; (4) by His obedience, manifested so conspicuously in His death, He, as the Representative of humanity, presented in sinful humanity an offering "holy, acceptable unto GOD, which is our reasonable service"; and (5) by His sympathy and humanity, so graciously displayed in His last moments, He shows how the human yearning after tenderness and pity in GOD may be satisfied:

"'Tis the weakness in strength that I cry for! my flesh that I seek
In the Godhead! I seek it and find it. O Saul, it shall be
A Face like my face that receives thee; a Man like to me
Thou shalt love and be loved by for ever; a Hand like this hand
Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee! See the CHRIST stand."

We are now in a position to understand what is meant by such terms as expiation, propitiation, and remission of sins. The expiation of CHRIST, if the term is to have any meaning in His case, is not to be confounded with the old idea that expiation is due to outraged divinities,[1] which was repugnant not only to the enlightened philosopher Cicero,[2] but also contrary to the very spirit of the Jewish law, which represented reconciliation as proceeding, not from the offender, but from the offended one—from GOD, not from man.[3] CHRIST was *set forth* by GOD;[4] He was given by GOD.[5] Egoism was the foundation of the pagan sacrifices, which were regarded as means to bribe and flatter; whereas, according to the

[1] "Violatis deis expiatio debetur."

[2] See "De Leg.," i. 14, 40: "But, indeed, of crimes against men and gods there is no expiation"; and "Let not the impious dare to appease the gods with gifts" ("De Leg.," ii. 16).

[3] "The life of the flesh is in the blood, and I *have given it* to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls" (Lev. xvii. 11).

[4] Rom. iii. 25.

[5] John iii. 16.

Scriptural view of sacrifice, its foundation was the grace of GOD. It is clear, then, that expiation in the Biblical use cannot mean a modification of Divine wrath or a winning of Divine favour. But if it has any meaning, it signifies the *covering* of our deficiency with His sufficiency —a filling up the measure of duty and love owed to GOD, and reasserting the Divine life among men. Or, if we take the Hebrew *kipper*[1] in the other sense of blot out or purify, it signifies that the Cross is the emblem of forgiven sin, the seal of GOD'S love and union with man, not of vengeance appeased by death. This is in harmony with the higher view of the Atonement which represents the blood-shedding as the offering of a *life*, not a death, to GOD. We could not be Christians in the sense of followers of CHRIST—Who revealed GOD as a loving FATHER Who doth not exact the uttermost farthing, but Who watches over, protects, and supports His children, and desires that they should be good and find their happiness in Him—if we believed that the Sacrifice of His death was necessary to appease the outraged feelings of GOD, Who was all the time in CHRIST reconciling the world unto Himself. There is no trace of primitive barbarism in this idea; neither is there any pagan element in this propitiation.

It is remarkable that it is St. John, whose themes are the transcendent love of GOD and the Divine life communicated to man, who used the word "propitiation"

[1] *Kipper.* The Assyrian equivalent, according to Dr. C. F. Burney, means "brightness" (כִּפָּר) ; the Aramaic and Syriac means "to wipe clean with a sponge"; the Arabic *kafara*, "obliterate," not "cover." Dr. Driver (Hastings, "Dictionary of Bible," art. "Propitiation") says: "It does not greatly signify whether we start from the idea of *covering over* or *wiping out;* in either case the idea which the metaphor is intended to convey is that of *rendering null or inoperative.* There are analogies in the Old Testament for each explanation." Ritschl adopted the protective view of *kipper* as a cover of our creatureliness, which cannot exist without some such protection in GOD'S presence (Exod. xxxiii. 20).

(ἱλασμός) in the only two passages where it occurs in the New Testament;[1] while the verb "to propitiate" (ἱλάσκεσθαι) occurs in Luke (xviii. 13—"GOD be merciful,"[2] who records the parable of the Prodigal Son's forgiveness), and in Hebrews (ii. 17—"to propitiate the sins of the people"). It is significant that the verb, which in classical Greek has as object the person propitiated, in Biblical Greek has sin for its object. CHRIST is not said to propitiate GOD, but our sins—that is, to remove them. He does not change GOD to us, but us to GOD, by dealing directly with that which hinders our grasping the love of GOD and our participating in His Divine life. This propitiation, which originates with GOD and not with man, is unique, but it cannot be explained satisfactorily as a working down of the Divine resentment by the Divine

[1] 1 John ii. 2; i. 4, 10: ἱλαστήριον. Rom. iii. 25, most probably an adjective masculine, "propitiatory" (Drs. Driver and Sanday); Maurice renders "mercy-seat" ("Sacrifice," p. 153).

[2] ἱλάσθητί μοι, ἱλάσκομαι is never in LXX or New Testament in the middle form, as in classics, of propitiating GOD, but always in passive of GOD being gracious and forgiving (Exod. xxxii. 14; 2 Kings v. 18; Ps. lxxviii. 9; Luke xviii. 13). It is never found with accusative of GOD as in Josephus ("Ant.," vi. 6, 5) and Homer, etc., but with accusative of sin. *Cf.* the Hebrew *kipper* in the extra-ritual literature of the Old Testament. The person who covers is GOD; that which is covered is the offence, never the offending party. If the person is mentioned, the act is done for or in his behalf (Deut. xxi. 8; Ezek. xvi. 63). Seeming exceptions occur in 1 Sam. xxvi. 19. Bishop Westcott, "Commentary on Epistle of St. John," additional note on 1 John ii. 2: "These constructions . . . show that the Scriptural conception of ἱλάσκεσθαι (to propitiate) is not that of appeasing one who is angry, with a personal feeling against the offender, but of altering the character of that which from without occasions a necessary alienation, and interposes an obstacle to fellowship. Such phrases as "propitiation of GOD" and "GOD being reconciled" are foreign to the language of the New Testament. Man is reconciled. There is a propitiation in the matter of the sin or of the sinner. The love of GOD is the same throughout, but He cannot, by virtue of His very nature, welcome the impenitent and the sinful; and, more than this, He 'cannot' treat sin as if it were not sin." It seems a pity that the link between the Old Testament and the New in (ἐξ)ιλάσκομαι should have been broken by the rendering of it and its derivatives in the Old Testament by *atone* and in the New Testament by *propitiate*.

suffering for man, and so as a self-propitiation. This was Bushnell's view.[1] But it would seem more true to say that in the Person of CHRIST GOD turned His Divine energy and love, hampered by the selfishness and limited by the rebelliousness of man, into a new channel, the recovery of the race He had created from the dominion of sin, by a signal proof of His goodwill and pardoning love. It was upon our hearts of sin that His Divine power was put forth, so that we in Him might be reconciled to GOD. GOD'S mercy and truth, His inviolable law and invincible love, met in the Life of JESUS as in a mercy-seat which covered the sin, and through which man has access to GOD. There was no Divine Being Who required to be made favourable; but it was man whose heart required to be turned to GOD. "Turn us, O LORD, and we shall be turned."[2] "Turn yourselves," wrote Ezekiel.[3] In CHRIST we are turned to GOD; in CHRIST we are pardoned; in CHRIST we have fellowship with GOD.

The self-sacrifice of the FATHER, Who "spared not His only SON," Who gave His Only Begotten, confirms this view. That self-sacrifice was realised and responded to in the self-renunciation of the SON manifested in humanity —a response to the FATHER'S love, a vindication of the FATHER'S goodness in humanity, which had till then not adequately responded to the one or vindicated the other. May we not regard the frequently recurring evangelical expression, "Thou art My beloved SON," or "This is My beloved SON, in Whom I am well pleased,"[4] as proof that

[1] "Forgiveness and Law," pp. 41 *et seq.*

[2] Commination Service.

[3] Ezek. xiv. 6, xviii. 30, 32, etc.; Joel ii. 12; Hos. xii. 6.

[4] Matt. iii. 17: "This is My beloved SON . . ." (xii. 18; quotation of Isa. xlii. 1); Matt. xvii. 5: "This is . . ." (Transfiguration); Mark i. 11: "Thou art . . ."; ix. 7: "This is My . . ."; Luke iii. 22: "Thou art . . ."; ix. 35: "This is My . . ." (ἀγαπητός or ἐκλελεγμένος). *Cf.* John i. 14: "Glory as the Only Begotten from the FATHER."

the writers of the Synoptic Gospels considered that whatever Divine satisfaction there was, lay in the FATHER'S approval of the SON'S righteousness. For the law of righteousness, which demanded recognition in the conscience of man, was fulfilled in a cosmic and absolute manner, in the SPIRIT by the SON, Who responded, adequately and completely, to the love and law of the FATHER even unto death. While the Fourth Gospel throws light on the oneness of will and mind and purpose and co-operation in all things concerning the salvation of His people[1] which revealed the CHRIST as the Only Begotten from the FATHER, Whom the FATHER loved. "I and My FATHER are one";[2] "My FATHER worketh hitherto, and I work";[3] "The SON can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the FATHER doing. For whatsoever He doeth, the SON doeth likewise. For the FATHER loveth the SON";[4] "I must work the works of Him that sent Me";[5] "The works which the FATHER hath given Me to finish[6] bear witness that the FATHER hath sent Me";[7] "For the FATHER Who abideth in Me, He doeth the works" (or His works);[8] "I seek not Mine own will, but the will of the FATHER that sent Me";[9] "Therefore doth My FATHER love Me, because I lay down My life that I may take it again";[10] "This commandment have I received of My FATHER";[11] "I love the FATHER, and as the FATHER gave Me commandment, even so I do."[12] This work was the reconcilement of man. And the result of this co-operation, of this Divine fellowship in will and work, is the Atonement of GOD and man. "If any man love Me, he will keep My

[1] *Cf.* xiv. 23. [2] John x. 30. [3] John v. 17.
[4] John v. 19. [5] John ix. 4.
[6] τελειώσω. *Cf.* "And the third day I am perfected (τελειοῦμαι), or My work is consummated" (Luke xiii. 32).
[7] John v. 36. [8] John xiv. 10. [9] John v. 30.
[10] John x. 17. [11] John x. 18. [12] John xiv. 31.

sayings, and My FATHER will love him, and We shall come to him and make Our abode with him,"[1] a figurative expression for the union of GOD and man in CHRIST. The work was finished on the Cross, where His own word, τετέλεσται,[2] announced its consummation in the perfected forgivableness of CHRIST in man, and the complete forgiveness of man in CHRIST. Thus, there is a remission of sins, not an overlooking of sin (πάρεσις), but a real dismissal (ἄφεσις), which is an earnest of its complete removal (ἀθέτησις).[3] And this means a full and free forgiveness of man issuing from the spontaneous and unconditioned love of the FATHER and the SON, which is imparted to humanity by the indwelling SPIRIT, Who proceedeth from both. This remission of the sinner is not "a kind of formality which says 'go,' but leaves the prison doors closed,"[4] a mere letting off, but it is a setting free (1) by remitting—I do not say the conscience of past guilt, which is one with our personal identity, or the fact that we have sinned, which is unalterable, but—the terrors of an evil conscience, its dread of death and doom, which become completely absorbed in the love and life of CHRIST; and (2) by imparting a new principle, motive and ideal of life, loyalty, love and the FATHER'S will.

Remission is closely allied with redemption, the former term being more nearly connected with the thing from which we are freed; the latter with that which is set free. We speak of "remission of sins," but of the "redemption of the body." The observance of this rule would have saved the Church from the repellent theory of Origen; for λύτρον would have been understood as the instrument of freedom, that which makes free; and also from the

[1] John xiv. 23. *Cf.* "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, knowing that it is GOD Who worketh in you both to will and to do" (Phil. ii. 13).

[2] John xix. 30.

[3] Heb. ix. 20.

[4] Bushnell, "Vicarious Sacrifice," pp. 389 *et seq.*

theories of "equivalent punishment" and "equivalent suffering," which are likewise based on the theory of an external transaction, and which are inferior to the theory of an "equivalent sacrifice" of the FATHER and the SON, the outcome of an equivalent love, which are reproduced and re-enacted—on a much lower scale—in the life of redeemed humanity. GOD was in CHRIST reconciling the world unto Himself, delivering it from the power of sin by the ineffable mystery and effluence of the love of GOD, manifested in the Cross, and by the transcendent supernatural life there set free to work in the life of man.

The effect of this redemption is the setting free by the Divine SPIRIT, Who completes the work of the Cross, of the higher and nobler self, the will, the intellect and the spirit of man from the influence of past sins; from the desire to continue in such sin, from the sin of loving the world, from the sin of egoism, and all sins of hypocrisy and outward pretence; from the sin of having low ideals and coarse motives, and for the service of the living GOD; a setting free which is both emancipation from the power of the past and an endowment of a new life, a life which began in our forgiveness, and which thus takes on a forward as well as a backward reference—even the forthgiving of a new life.

Many writers, like Professor Schmiedel,[1] assert that forgiveness of past sin, which is included in this redemption, does not come through the sacrificial death of CHRIST—which Schmiedel asserts that JESUS did not take into consideration at all[2]—but through His revelation of the FATHER, Whose nature is indicated in the parable of the Prodigal Son. "Consequently," he remarks,

[1] See "Jesus or Christ?" p. 70.

[2] But see "to give His life a ransom for many" (Matt. xx. 28); "For this is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi. 28); "Thus it is written that the CHRIST should suffer" (Luke xxiv. 16).

"forgiveness of sins through GOD was not effected by JESUS, only revealed." But the future aspect of forgiveness, as the impartation of a power that helps the truly contrite and penitent to rise to higher habits and ideals of life, a power which is manifestly claimed by and connected with CHRIST,[1] may lead men to look in the same quarter for that forgiveness which means release from past habits and ideals.

Thus the doctrine of the Atonement meets one of the great tendencies of our day—the desire for social reform and social righteousness. A philanthropy which is concerned with the external and transitory phases of the human career is manifestly inferior to a Gospel of eternal character. The passion for social righteousness, for the realisation of a righteousness cosmic, ideal and personal—a passion which, without CHRIST, results in an equally passionate pessimism—with such an example and support glows with regenerative power. Accordingly, if the nature and essence of the Atonement be left mysterious by Scripture, and must be so left by man, its effect and influence on our lives we can feel, if we cannot understand. The preaching of a full and free forgiveness in the name of CHRIST may be foolishness to the world; but it is our highest wisdom and our supreme comfort.

[1] "I am the Resurrection and the Life" (John xi. 25).

CHAPTER III

THE SOURCE OF THE ATONEMENT

We have seen that we must start from a higher standpoint than man's need or the moral government of the world, when discussing a fact which is transcendental, above human experience, and confessedly unique in human history, a fact which may appear unrelated to, and therefore impossible to be adjusted to, the general knowledge of humanity, but which most assuredly has entered into human experience.

We may not classify, analyse, or explain it. But we may contemplate it, believe in it, appropriate it. In this way, although above our experience, it enters into our experience. All theories of the Atonement recognise that it is an action from God to man. Its source is that Divine goodness "which is writ large upon the Universe."[1] It is from the Divine standpoint that the Cross is to be considered. What did it mean for God? In what way did it affect Him or fulfil His purpose? It issued from Him. But the Cross was not an isolated phenomenon in His Divine experience, and falls into line with His other interpositions in the world-order by way of revelation and redemption. What we see primarily is not God answering the needs of man or setting right the moral order of the Universe, with which sin had interfered, as if the needs of man and the requirements of that order

[1] Dante, "Paradiso," vii. 109.

were things that could be considered apart from Him, but GOD fulfilling His own purpose, realising His own idea, hindered and thwarted as it had been by man.

The process of the Atonement, therefore, lies beyond our ken. Its rationale can never be understood by man, for man cannot place himself in the position of GOD, and view the world-order and the world-process as they appear to the Creator. But at least the attempt to consider the Atonement from such a standpoint will obviate the necessity of seeking analogies in human life and experience, human parallels of forgiveness, satisfaction, propitiation, and sacrifice; of regarding the sacrifice of CHRIST for man as simply an exaggerated form of martyrdom; of looking for its explanation in the religious symbols and rites of human experience; of considering human experience or the moral history of man as a test of the truth of a fact which claims to be exceptional, and therefore to be judged on its own merits.

As we venture, with all reverence, to take our stand with GOD, we see that what may appear abnormal to man may be normal to Him; we see the possibility of the source of physical and moral and spiritual energy extending His energy in new forms, to operate in an Incarnation and to reveal Himself in an Atonement. The very uniqueness of the Incarnation and the Atonement is a mark of their Divine origin. Both were conceived and carried out by Divine powers. We dare not say that our experience is a standard for the Divine or that what has been realised in human history is the only possibility inherent in GOD. At the same time, a consideration of the failures of human history would itself lead us to expect some, *to us*, fresh activity on the part of GOD; some, to us, fresh adaptation of the Divine energy and resources to the restoration of the Creation; some, to us, unique expression of His restoring love, of His atoning holiness. But as we

venture to construct a theory of the Atonement, we are bound to show that it was not a Divine charm or omnipotent spell which made Him Who fell beneath its influence right before GOD. We must show how the Cross falls into line with the original purpose of the creation of man in the image and after the likeness of GOD, that it helps forward the development of the same great process, that it furthers the same Divine idea, that it is part of the great spiritual dynamic by which GOD raises—readjusting to raise—the life of man to Himself; that the possibility of man's realising the likeness of GOD, of fulfilling the Divine idea of what man should be, is really increased by the Cross. We must show, in a word, that while it is supernatural to man, it is natural to GOD. In so doing, we shall follow the lead of Him Who looked at things from the Divine standpoint and from the experience of GOD, and Who said, "GOD so loved the world." And we shall see as we proceed that in the power of the truth that underlay that sentence to redeem and regenerate and raise the life of man we have evidence that the Cross, while beyond the limits and above the horizon of human experience, is nevertheless capable of acting upon it; that if it be not a part of the evolution of humanity, it is, at all events, a force that quickened and repaired that process of spiritual development when it was necessary, a decisive moment in its growth; and that such experience, if neither the test of such a doctrine nor the standpoint from which it is to be viewed, is at least capable of perceiving and receiving the Divine remedy for its disorder.

The cry *was* "back to CHRIST"; but *is* now "back to JESUS, and through Him to GOD." "Theology," writes Ritschl,[1] "in delineating the moral order of the world, must take as its starting-point that conception of GOD in which the relation of GOD to His SON is expressed; a

[1] "Justification and Reconciliation," iii. 259.

relation which by CHRIST's mediation is extended to His community." Accordingly, the complete Christian name of GOD is the GOD and FATHER of our LORD JESUS CHRIST. The key to the relation between GOD the FATHER and GOD the SON is contained in the declaration that GOD is love.[1] If it is in relation to this love that the Cross is viewed, it will be seen that the justice of the Atonement did not lie in the payment of a debt in any external sense or the bearing of an equivalent punishment in quantitative terms, and the subsequent transfer of merit and change of GOD's attitude to man, but rather that it consisted in the fact that GOD discharged the debt of holiness due to His own nature—His own consistency of character; His own moral order or truth[2]—which man could not do; and thus was established the principle of righteousness, "that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us." Thus the debt of a holy life was transformed into a bond of love. It was a triumph of law as a living righteousness and a righteous love. It was the overcoming of the world by CHRIST[3] in anticipation of, and as a source of, the victory of our faith which overcometh the world.[4]

There was a divine fitness, a heavenly justice in the fact that the SON of GOD, the image of the invisible GOD, should make possible a spiritual atonement for man, who had been created in the image of GOD, and has now put on the new man, who is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him.[5] In this regard GOD's righteousness consisted in His consistency in carrying out His purposes of love.[6] Even if we care not to assert that our LORD in any way as the SON of GOD was responsible

[1] "Justification and Reconciliation," p. 137.
[2] Athanasius, "De Incarn.," 6: *τὸ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν εὔλογον.*
[3] John xvi. 33. [4] 1 John v. 4.
[5] Gen. i. 26; Col. iii. 10.
[6] So Kaftan after Ritschl. Edgehill, "Faith and Fact," p. 138.

for the origin of moral evil or assumed its responsibility in any respect, it was very seemly that what stood in the way of man's re-creation, that what had caused the need of that re-creation, should be removed and annihilated by Him Who had in the first instance created man. "To Him," wrote Athanasius,[1] "it belonged to bring back the corrupted to incorruption, and to maintain what was reasonable on behalf of all with respect to the FATHER. For being the Word of the Father and supreme over all, He was able consequently, and He alone, to re-create all things and to suffer on behalf of all, and to be the representative in the interest of all to His FATHER." It was, indeed, seemly that the Creator of the cosmic scheme in the great struggle *humanam condere gentem* should not only sympathise with human failings to live in harmony with His law, but also help man to get right with the Universe. Our sense of justice, an instinct derived from GOD, approves of such a fulfilment of the law of divine life in order that the righteousness of that life might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the SPIRIT;[2] while our dissatisfaction with our own sinful nature, with our character and disposition as sin has made them, and our distress that our influence for good has been thereby weakened—for this preventive power of sin is its severest penalty—joined with our inability to make atonement for our sins or to deal with the psychological fact of guilt, are sufficient ground, reasonably and spiritually, for the expectation and belief that GOD Himself, in His own way and time, would remove the cause of our unhappiness and impotence, and strike the malignant growth at its very root. It would be natural and reasonable to expect this, and this expectation that our Creator should also be our Saviour—seeing that no one else could have either the

[1] Athanasius, "De Incarn.," 7: *τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων εὔλογον ἀποσῶσαι πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα . . . πρεσβεῦσαι.*

[2] Rom. viii. 1.

adequate spiritual power or the universal interest in man —were also natural and reasonable. And the fact that this expectation has been fulfilled in a marvellous and mysterious way is a proof in itself of the justice of GOD, which may, with all reverence, be described as His responsibility to man; while man's responsibility to GOD has been fulfilled by the perfect obedience and self-surrender of the Son of Man, the earnest and the source of our penitence, devotion, and self-sacrifice; an obedience which was at once a condemnation of sin and an inspiration, even a principle of spiritual regeneration for man. As Sir Oliver Lodge finely says:[1] "The attitude of GOD has changed no whit; there never was any hostility to be wiped out in blood; He had felt no wrath at the blind efforts, the risings and sinkings of men struggling in the mire from bestial to human attributes; there was nothing to appease. But there was plenty to reveal: an infinitude of compassion, an ideal of righteousness, the inevitableness of law, the hopelessness of rebellion, the power of faith, the quenching of superstitious fear in filial love; a real and not a mechanical salvation, no legal quibble, but a deep eternal truth."

The Cross was a manifestation of GOD'S love and a revelation of His righteousness. Nor may we say there was not something more—a mysterious bearing of the wrath of GOD against sin. As the same writer says: "I am sure that what may without irreverence be humanly spoken of as fierce wrath against sin, and even against a certain class of sinner, is a Divine attribute."[2] Indeed, as Maurice said, "Wrath against that which is unlovely is not the counteracting force to love, but the attribute of it."[3] The moral theory of the Atonement by itself lacks

[1] "Man and the Universe," p. 228.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 249. He also speaks of a certain class of sin against which "GOD'S anger blazes."

[3] "Theological Essays," p. 36 (Macmillan's series).

ballast and power. It is the removal of our sin, the annihilation of that which separates, that gives us courage. The New Theology[1] may not acknowledge such Divine wrath. But apart from anthropomorphic and anthropopathic conceptions of Deity, there is a real wrath of GOD against sin. The wrath of GOD against sin is one of the three connecting links between the New Testament and the Old. The other two are His holiness and His love, which are manifested in correction or chastisement, which is directed by mercy, and tends to sanctification and salvation. According to Ecclesiasticus,[2] "Mercy and wrath come from Him, and His indignation resteth upon sinners. He is mighty to forgive, and poureth forth His displeasure. As His mercy is great, so is His displeasure." Parental compromise is a fault in the genial parent that leads to the fall of a guileless child. Such weakness is not in the Holy FATHER, Who worketh for the weal of His children. The love that proves and reproves in order to sanctify and save is the highest form of a holy love. It has a spiritual note of holiness, the ethical note of judgment.[3] It is the necessary reaction of the Divine energy and holiness against the opposition presented to its self-realisation in the life of humanity by the "mind of the flesh," which is "enmity against GOD."[4] The life

[1] "New Theology," p. 18 (R. J. Campbell).

[2] Ecclus. v. 6, xvi. 11, 12; *cf.* Matt. iii. 7: "the wrath to come"; John iii. 36: "the wrath of GOD abideth on him"; Rom. i. 18: "a wrath of GOD is revealed from heaven upon all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who keep down the truth in unrighteousness"; Rom. ii. 5: "treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath"; Rom. ix. 22: "if GOD be willing to show His wrath . . . vessels of wrath"; Eph. v. 6: "the wrath of GOD"; Eph. ii. 3: "children of wrath"; Rev. vi. 16: "the wrath of the Lamb": Rev. xiv. 10: "the cup of His wrath"; Rev. xix. 15: "the wrath of GOD"; 1 Thess. i. 10: "Who delivereth us from the wrath to come"; Ps. vii. 11: "GOD is a righteous judge, yea, a GOD that hath indignation every day"; Ps. ii. 12: "kiss the SON, lest He be angry."

[3] "What religion needs most of all is to regain the moral salt of judgment" (Forsyth, "Cruciality of the Cross," p. 203).

[4] Rom. viii. 7.

of sin is an active state of hostility to God, and such impediment to His righteous purpose must be overcome or ever His energising love and holiness can have free play in the life of man. Such wrath is not to be confounded with personal resentment. It is the Divine sentence on sin, which, without the soothing, illumining love that redeems, becomes its own punishment by leading to an increased hardness of heart, a further estrangement from the source of happiness and peace. In this light the wrath of God is not merely an eschatological conception, or, as Ritschl[1] described it, "an unfixed and formless theologoumenon," but is the law of the Divine order working itself out in human life. There may not seem to be any direct outward sentence on the wicked man. He may flourish like a bay-tree. But in the increasing indifference, callousness, and bitterness of soul; in the growing sense of inability to resist evil; of opposition to the Divine Will; of alienation from all that is true and pure and good—all the sweet restraining and guiding influences and motives of life; in the ever-increasing difficulty to do what is right, and hatred of those whose presence is a reminder of forsaken ideals and deserted paths; in the sinking lower and lower into the abysmal deeps of sin, there is evidence of a real wrath of God which withholds peace and creates unrest for the conscience that is not void of offence, until the sin be repented of and eradicated from the life, and the sinner has learnt to find his rest in God. After this manner God permits us to punish ourselves for our sins by forming such a character, which is both the consequence of man's own free will and that sentence of God's holy will on the sin of man, which admonishes us that judgment is not so much a future scene as a present, continuous, and eternal process. There is a very real sense in which the

[1] "Justification and Reconciliation," ii. 154.

wrath of GOD abideth on him who doth not believe or serve or love; there is a very real manner in which GOD'S opposition to evil is felt in the soul of man.

A perfect revelation of GOD must, accordingly, embody the principle that sin ought not to be, and consequently in the kingdom of righteousness must not be. The Cross of GOD must thus in some way convey the idea that GOD'S love would save man from the sentence of Divine holiness on its sin.[1] It must express the judicial and ethical aspect of the Will of GOD, that would sanctify and save, purge and purify, redeem and raise. For if the GOD of the New Testament is a loving, holy FATHER, He is also a "consuming fire."[2]

And this, the sterner aspect of the Divine life as it energises in humanity, removing in order to restore, is by no means a negligible factor in the development of man and the advance of the kingdom of GOD. In our LORD'S own character not the least Divine trait was His "inflexible determination to maintain at all costs the interests of righteousness and truth."[3] In a moral ruler of the universe such a determination, no matter how it would be expressed, directly or indirectly, would be an essential element of moral perfection. The Scriptures keep that determination prominently before us in the zeal of Jehovah for His own holiness and honour; in the enthusiasm of JESUS for the FATHER'S Will.

According to this view, there can be no meaning in the dogma that our LORD endured vicariously the wrath of GOD, which would signify that He suffered in our stead the punishment of our sins, which we must suffer in our own lives if we are to have the healing influence of the Spirit of JESUS, Who sanctifies and saves "so as through fire."[4] He manifested the same inflexible determination

[1] John iii. 17. [2] Heb. xii. 29.
[3] Martineau (quoted by Orr, "Anger," Hastings, "Dictionary of the Bible"). [4] 1 Cor. iii. 15.

to uphold the right; He expressed the holiness of GOD in its negative and positive forms—or, rather, in its antagonistic aspect and its reconciling attitude—of removing and restoring, of sentencing[1] and saving.

The Cross thus emphasises the sinfulness of sin. And this aspect of our LORD's work must not be overlooked in these days, when sin does not seem an evil thing, when men have grown accustomed to it, and become inclined to tolerate it, because of their own sinfulness and shortcomings. This may possibly be the reason why the modern mind is not favourable to the idea of an objective Atonement.[2] Sin, especially in the sense of a self-centred or unbelieving life, does not provoke human wrath; and it is hard to conceive that it provokes the Divine wrath—and this, as we have seen, is that sentence on sin which is the result both of the free will of man and the opposing energy of the holiness of GOD. There was a manifestation of the holiness of GOD on the Cross; an expression of His hostility to and condemnation of sin, made not against, but in the Person of, His beloved SON, Who vindicated the holy law and asserted the holy love of the FATHER, hallowing His Name in the homage of His life, fulfilling His law in the sacrifice of His death.

There was no change effected in the relation of GOD to man, for the work of redemption comes from the FATHER'S love. There was no false opposition of a Divine justice to a Divine mercy, for it was GOD'S mercy and love that found expression in the Incarnation, which was for our salvation, as Athanasius said.[3] But there was a manifestation of GOD'S righteousness and love to man that changed the attitude of man to GOD. Whatever should be done, we believe He did for us.

[1] "GOD sending His own SON in the likeness of the flesh of sin, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh" (Rom. viii. 3).

[2] See Dale's "Atonement," pp. 338 *et seq.*

[3] *κατὰφιλα νθρωπίαν καὶ ἀγαθότητα τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ Πατρος* (Athanasius, "De Incarn.," chap. i.).

And if that in man which had given dissatisfaction to the FATHER was removed, essentially and potentially, by the Son of Man, there was something that might, metaphorically speaking, be described as a manifestation or demonstration of the "wrath" or righteous attitude of GOD to sin.[1] The principle of justice here involved would not lie merely in the relation of man to GOD, but of GOD to Himself. "GOD cannot deny Himself."[2] It was only another equally pure and gracious Being Who could enter into the FATHER'S feelings on the subject of man's sin. It was therefore just that He should do so Who alone could. Likewise it was just that He Who could sympathise perfectly with man—having experienced all the ills and temptations of the flesh—should be our Intercessor and Judge. Such was the justice of the Atonement.

The Incarnation is the key of the problem. It enables us to perceive that GOD was in CHRIST removing the sin of the world; reconciling the world unto Himself; bearing the responsibility of the Creator of a race for which, considering the conditions of human growth and freedom, sin was inevitable, and feeling in the abysmal deeps of His all-inclusive and all-pervading Personality the consequences of the sin of humanity. How meagre do such theories as the satisfaction of Divine justice and the confession of human sin appear beside this splendid conception—the manifestation of Divine love and the revelation of Divine righteousness! And in place of the wrath of GOD revealed upon all ungodliness there is a manifestation of the FATHER'S righteousness in the Godliness of His SON. There is nothing forensic in such a justice. It lay in the eternal necessity of the Divine

[1] *πρὸς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ* (to display or give a proof of), Rom. iv. 25; *cf. τὴν οὖν ἔνδειξιν τῆς ἀγάπης ὑμῶν* (the proof of your love), 2 Cor. v. 24.

[2] 2 Tim. ii. 13.

Nature to give love and to conquer sin by a vindication of the righteousness of GOD[1] in the life and death of His SON, which was the most convincing proof of His love.

The grace of the Atonement, accordingly, is not the favour of a sovereign, but the free gift of a FATHER, Who is represented in the Scriptures as providing the Sacrifice on Calvary, as on Mount Moriah, by which exhibition of Divine sorrow and sympathy the object-lesson was given, that, whereas the pagans held that the angry gods were appeased by hecatombs of beasts slain involuntarily,[2] our GOD and FATHER desires the willing self-sacrifice of His children—the free-will offering of their lives in love and voluntary obedience on His altar. That is, GOD does not want their death, but their life, and so He offers them the gift of Life which can enable them to conquer sin and to overcome death, so that where sin abounded grace might much more abound.

In its earliest conception, sacrifice meant a gift—the surrender of something when property was rare. The sacrifice of living creatures, which implied their absolute surrender, involved their death. The development of the sense of sin raised the sin-offering into prominence. That in the Jewish sacrifices which is represented as rendering them acceptable was the degree in which they manifested the surrender of the offerer's life in his penitence, his gratitude, and his consecration to GOD.[3] The sacrifices served as an index of the state of the heart, as an expression of the soul. There was no intrinsic value in the sacrifice itself. Consequently, the psalmists and prophets[4]

[1] *πρὸς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ* (Rom. iii. 2).

[2] An idea repudiated by Cicero.

[3] Sin-offering, thank-offering, burnt-offering respectively.

[4] Ps. li. 16, 17: "Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it: Thou delightest not in burnt-offering. The sacrifices of GOD are a broken spirit: a broken and contrite heart, O GOD, Thou wilt not despise." *Cf.* Isa. i. 11: "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto Me?" (Jer. vii. 22; Hos. vi. 6; Isa. lvii. 15).

raised their voices against the continuance of sacrifices when they had lost their meaning. The grace of GOD accepted these symbols and tokens of man's repentant, thankful, and trusting life, but rejected them when offered in a perfunctory manner, because they were not the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual life. This moral and spiritual deficiency, which rendered the offerings unacceptable, emphasises the fact that these sacrifices were never intended to avert Divine anger or to win Divine favour, but to be a means of the manifestation of repentance and faith, and consequently the means whereby the soul might be raised to the knowledge of an unseen GOD. Where such an inner condition of soul was not, sacrifices were mere symbols without significance, through which the soul sank into materialism. In the sacrifices offered in love, repentance, homage, and devotion, GOD is represented as approaching the worshipper, accepting his devotion, blessing his gift, and helping him to participate in a communion of peace. But, as the prophets saw and proclaimed, there was no value or meaning in the *sacrifices* when there was no life for GOD to hallow or accept. But the acceptance of the sinner is not grounded upon his own worthiness or the worth of his sentiments, aspiration, or his works, but upon the free grace of GOD Who, in the first instance, provided the means of communion with Him both in the Old Testament and in the New, in the latter devising, in "the fulness of time," another means more spiritual and more personal by which man might have access to Him—even the Incarnation of His Only Begotten SON, "full of grace and truth," that whosoever believeth on Him should not die, but live.

The grace of the Atonement is not to be confined to this free gift of the Only Begotten SON, but it was also shown in GOD'S freely accepting the sacrifice, prayer, and

obedience of one on behalf of all; in permitting the one to represent the many; in continuing the grace of the incarnate life in the grace of a redeemed and restored life; in allowing the Spirit of the SON to abide upon the Body of CHRIST and to sanctify its fellowship and communion with Him. It was a free gift, a free pardon, a free life.

For such grace there is no room in Anselm's theory. By it we are altogether under law. For if satisfaction be made and the debt paid, we are legally free from all obligations, even to repent. But, according to this theory, the self-propitiation of Deity is the promise and potency of our penitence, devotion, and self-sacrifice—all which move on the lines of freedom. For the only *compelling* theory in Christianity is the "constraining love of CHRIST," which St. Paul mentions in connection with the Atonement and the appropriation of its grace by man.[1] "Forgiving each other," he writes in another place, "as GOD in CHRIST forgave you."[2] In this act of grace which proceeds from GOD, and in this life which returns to GOD, the life of GOD is realised in humanity. Circulating in full force to the very limits of humanity, it turns aside with the strong stream of its Divine spiritual life—wherever that life is accepted and appropriated—the counter current of evil. Accordingly, when we speak of the Atonement of JESUS we mean the effect of His Divine life and power in counteracting the influence and in staying the course and force of sin in human life, and in raising the soul of man to the state of righteousness in which he was intended by GOD to realise the purposes of his

[1] "For the love of CHRIST constraineth us: because we thus judge that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that He died for (ὑπέρ) all, that they who live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto Him Who for their sakes died and rose again. . . . Wherefore if any man be in CHRIST, he is a new creature" (2 Cor. v. 14-17). Notice how the resurrection as well as the death of CHRIST is *for man*.

[2] Eph. iv. 32.

creation, not in changing the FATHER'S mood or relation to us from wrath to forgiveness, not in paying a penalty and procuring a full release, but in manifesting that FATHER'S righteousness and love in a manner that wins men to keep His law for love, and so changes their hearts to Him.

This Atonement was begun in the Incarnation and consummated by His death and resurrection, and is variously described in the New Testament and in patristic writings, now in Hebrew sacrificial symbols, and now in Latin law terms. For the ordinary man the practical question is not whether he accepts this or that view of the Atonement, but what effect that Divine Life and Death and Resurrection have upon his own life. For it is a law of spiritual as well as of physical and moral life that nothing which is not assimilated or appropriated can support. CHRIST Himself is our Atonement. He Himself, and not any theological theory of the work He accomplished, saves and sanctifies. It was on Himself, His Life and Death, Resurrection and Return in the Spirit, that He would fix the attention and rivet the hopes of men. It is not beautifully rounded formulæ and logically constructed schemes that give balm to the wounded conscience and healing to the diseased soul, but only the Divine Person, Who ever lives and loves, and Whose work is as imperfectly expressed by the terms we use as His Person is inadequately set forth in the Creeds. For He removed that which is wrong, weak, untrue, unholy, selfish, and impure from man by turning his heart to the obedience and service of GOD, and by drawing all men upwards to the ideal life that was raised high above human nature in the sublimity of its suffering, and exalted above all the world in the transcendental glory of its resurrection.

The end of the Atonement, accordingly, was not to

make a mere way of escape from deserved punishment, but to bring about the final cause of the Creation—the perfect realisation of all the powers of body, soul, and spirit, which were intended by GOD to be developed and perfected in His service. This throws light on the nature of sin, which is central to all ethic. Men of science may not concern themselves with their sins; but the growing science of psychology must take account of sin as a something that has arrested the moral evolution of humanity, has obstructed its progress, and interfered with the ascent of man. This fact, that sin is an impediment to the development of man's spiritual and moral nature, is a proof that it is not an original part of that nature, but is an alien and intruding element. Nor is it so much a passive element of ignorance, or limitation, or defect, as the activity of self manifested in rebellion, and putting man wrong with GOD and man, his true self, and his moral and spiritual environment, which must create a feeling of friction and unrest. Sin to this view is not therefore a metaphysical notion or an abstract entity, but a real factor in human life, with very real and tragic results. Its sphere is the perverted will. Good and evil can only be predicated of the will; they have, as was shown in the first lecture, no meaning apart from personality. Sin is a something inseparable from a self—a self-distinguishing consciousness, repentance being an abhorring of self.[1] Redemption, accordingly, is the emancipation of the will from the corrupting and constraining influences that have perverted it and turned man's natural love for GOD into hostility and enmity by suggesting evil thoughts, words, and deeds. This emancipation leads to service by the power of a new life and love given to us by GOD in CHRIST, Whose sacrifice was the

[1] Job xlii. 6: "I abhor myself" (אֶמְאָס=repudiate, reject, from root meaning *to push* or *thrust away*), "and repent in dust and ashes."

offering of His whole life, made on our behalf, and in this sense in our stead, that we were not able to offer it by reason of our sinful and perverted will. And this offering made by CHRIST in His human nature, as the Representative of man, rendered it possible for man to offer "the living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto GOD, which is our reasonable service."[1]

Such was and is the spiritual efficacy of the work done by CHRIST on behalf of man and in the matter of sin—a work as mysterious as the sin with which it had to do. But as we contemplate the Cross and Passion and witness the sufferings of the GOD-Man, we understand how it is that, while there is no legal absolution in the world, there is the law of Divine forgiveness which supersedes the law of legal retribution and absolves the penitent. The Incarnation and the personal character of the Incarnate illustrated this principle, which is higher than the natural or legal—even the Spirit of Divine love which is manifested as GOD's will. And GOD's law being the order in which He expresses Himself and manifests His Divine essence, and that essence being Love, His mercy is the measure of His existence, and His love goes forth in the grace of pardon and peace, because it is the law of the Divine nature to forgive and atone.

That Divine love ever responds to human needs. The Incarnation was the Divine answer to the human aspiration for union with GOD; the Atonement was the Divine answer to the human need for deliverance from the sin that separates man from GOD. The basis of the Atonement was, therefore, the FATHER's love. "For GOD so loved the world that He gave His Only Begotten SON." GOD's love is the beginning and the end; the creator and the perfector of all things. It embraces every form of life that has emanated from Him, for He is the Life.

[1] Rom. xii. 1.

Every being is embraced by that love, every heart can be reached by that love, and every spirit is reconciled by that love.

There was no antagonism between the FATHER and the SON expressed in and removed by the Atonement. We cannot conceive the FATHER as external to the SON in His work for man. What CHRIST did and suffered the FATHER did and suffered in Him. The Incarnation in its Kenosis and its Cross is a revelation of the suffering and love of the FATHER and the SON. The Redemption was the completion of the Creation, being the fulfilment of its self-giving energy—self-sacrificing love of the FATHER, SON, and HOLY SPIRIT. Thus the spiritual union of the FATHER and the SON was the living basis of the Atonement which made it possible and practical. Accordingly, we see the FATHER in everything the SON was and did, and therefore the suffering FATHER in the CHRIST reconciling the world unto Himself. The FATHER sacrificed Himself in His gift of the SON; the SON sacrificed Himself in His separation from the FATHER'S Glory and Presence as they had been for Him. And so in the Cross, the crowning episode of a life of self-surrender, we see GOD making rather than accepting sacrifice. Love was accordingly the ground of the Atonement—a FATHER'S love to which the SON responded. For it was from the Divine love and thought, rather than from the human need and demand, that this great conception originated. And of love self-sacrifice is the proof and sacrament.

Love was also the means and method of the Atonement—the SON'S love—His love for GOD: "Therefore doth My FATHER love Me, because I lay down My life, that I may take it again . . . This commandment have I received of My FATHER";[1] and His love for us: "Who

[1] John x. 17, 18.

loved me and gave Himself for me."[1] And love is the end of the Atonement—the love that leads to godly sorrow for sin, and so to forgiveness[2]—the love for one's fellow-man which forgives: "Beloved, if GOD so loved us, we ought also to love one another."[3]

Thus GOD'S plan for man's salvation is rooted and grounded in love. It is based on love, it energises in love, it issues in love; and that is reasonable and natural, seeing that GOD is love. Where love is the ruling principle there is no legal transaction, no arithmetical equation, no penal satisfaction, but perfect identity of thought, will, and feeling. Such harmony existed between the FATHER and the SON, the One Man in Whom the FATHER was satisfied, because His action was the expression of the FATHER'S thought and His sympathy was the manifestation of the FATHER'S love. For so completely did the SON identify Himself with the FATHER'S love and the FATHER'S righteousness that before the creation of man His Will consented to the Incarnation and His heart embraced the Atonement, so that He was virtually in His FATHER'S mind and in His own thought—for thought is action with Deity—"the Lamb as it had been slain from the foundation of the world." In the fulness of time He gave expression to His FATHER'S thought and His own. And by the Eternal SPIRIT—that SPIRIT Who is the source of order in the Creation, Who presided at the Incarnation as the foundation of the unity of the Divine and the human in CHRIST JESUS, and is the eternal principle of the union of GOD and man, and of man and man in the world—by that SPIRIT the SON of GOD tabernacled in a human nature and learned to subdue the human will into accord with that Divine

[1] Gal. ii. 20.

[2] Luke vii. 47: "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much."

[3] 1 John iv. 11.

purpose He had already embraced, and to which the whole creation moves; and then, when His mission was accomplished, by the same Eternal SPIRIT, He offered Himself without spot to GOD.[1] Ineffable is the love the FATHER hath for One Who so completely showed His Spirit, assimilated His idea and leaped forward to perform it; absorbed His affection, and realised His Will, even the vindication of Divine righteousness and the manifestation of Divine love by an act which was not only the crowning revelation of the FATHER'S love, but the supreme expression of His own love for humanity and for GOD. Behind that solidaric unity of CHRIST with GOD, which Ritschl recognised as leading to the inauguration of the kingdom of GOD, there was a unity of nature and character which Ritschl did not recognise, but which is expressed in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel—"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with GOD, and the Word was GOD." The Word of GOD—the Only Begotten of the FATHER—alone could enter so fully into the Divine purpose as to identify Himself with it and bear, not the penalty, but the sin of man; just as His sympathy with man compelled Him to bear man's troubles, sorrows, and sins in order to save man from them, and in this sense to suffer and to die for man. The SON alone could reveal the FATHER'S grace and truth; the SON alone could realise the FATHER'S will—"Lo, I come to do Thy will, O GOD";[2] "Thou art My beloved SON, in Whom I am well pleased"[3]—because the SON alone could love the FATHER with such absorbing fulness and intensity that the realisation of the FATHER'S idea was the inner necessity of His being; that in which His personality must realise itself. For Him the cause of humanity that needed redemption from its sin was the

[1] Heb. ix. 14. [2] Heb. x. 7.
[3] Mark i. 11; Matt. iii. 17, xvii. 5; Luke iii. 22.

cause of the FATHER, Whose love had not been revealed or realised in humanity until His Life and Death became an adequate manifestation in time and within humanity of the Divine attitude of forgiveness and restoring graciousness, and an adequate confession in time and in humanity of the holiness and righteousness of GOD. Such is the principle of the origin and process of the Atonement—love, which made the FATHER share the sufferings of the SON and the SON realise the FATHER'S will.

To simplify the argument: the FATHER did not love the SON because He consented to any vigorous demands, because He submitted to any cruel conditions, because He accepted any heavy terms. The Son of Man was Himself the FATHER'S gift, a gift that implied self-sacrifice on the FATHER'S part. The temporal separation from His beloved One, His Only Begotten, must have filled that FATHER'S heart with anguish, for surely it is legitimate to speak of the anguish of Deity if it is permissible to speak of His wrath. And Sir Oliver Lodge remarks "that the essence of truth contained in that persistent element of popular theology, the idea of sacrificial and vicarious suffering, would appear to be that the responsible task of evolution from animal to higher man, the struggle *humanam condere gentem* could not be undertaken and carried through even by Deity without grievous suffering and agonising patience." . . . "And from this point of view (the personal) the genuineness of Divine suffering, no matter how inevitable, has always been recognised as a revelation of Divine and Fatherly love."[1]

Our LORD revealed no stern Creator, no relentless exactor of justice, but a Father of mercy and love, yearning over the constitution He had planned in His own

[1] "Man and the Universe," pp. 231 *et seq.* Sir Oliver's remark anent "this sympathetic shudder through the whole of existence" recalls Rom. viii. 22: πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνωδινεῖ ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν.

mind, disordered by the intrusion of an enemy, a hostile will, grieving over the human life He had created in His own image and after His likeness, in innocence and beauty, now disfigured by sickness and wasted by sin. But He was not alone. For the New Testament describes One with Him, the Offspring and expression of His love and glory,[1] consenting to His will in His innermost soul, and realising His purpose in His innermost thought. The self-sacrifice of the FATHER in the Creation called forth the self-sacrifice of the SON in the Atonement, which dealt with that actuality, the possibility of which was conceded by the self-limitation of Deity. That self-limitation of Deity, a phase of His self-sacrifice, not being a necessity of His nature, but the outcome of His free volition, is the only rational explanation and ground of human freedom; the only possible way of avoiding the conclusion to which the consideration of the life of man would otherwise lead—namely, that GOD is not only responsible for the possibility of moral evil, but also for its actuality. The doctrine of Divine immanence does not explain everything. It has a pantheistic tendency which must be counteracted by the doctrine of transcendence if the human will, its responsibility and atonement, are to be safeguarded. As Dr. Martineau said: "At the boundary of the proper *Ego*, the absorbing claims of the supreme will arrests itself and recognises a ground on which it does not mean to step."[2] Our freedom is conceded by the Author of our being—being involved indeed in what He has caused, but excepted from what He is causing, so that the gruesome details of human history are not essential, but only incidental to the world-purpose and world-order, and evil appears as a by-

[1] ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, where ὑπόστασις is used in the immaterial sense of Aristotle. Arnobius, "Adv. Gent.," vii. 28, 22, used it as equivalent to οὐσία.

[2] "A Study of Religion," ii. 166 (Second Edition).

product, unnecessary, if inevitable,[1] and eventually to be swallowed up of good.

The self-limitation of GOD, which does not detract from His infinitude—for what is relinquished is potentially retained—is the only explanation of His relation to His Word, and to His creature man, and of their relations to Him. Our LORD'S self-limitation in His life and powers was the counterpart of the FATHER'S self-limitation in the life and history of man. And if His Word was the Divine means of Atonement, the FATHER was the Divine source. For the Divine life that was communicated by the FATHER, the fountain of Godhead, was the channel by which the Divine love entered the Redeemer's heart and moved Him to reveal and fulfil His FATHER'S love and His own self-sacrifice. For "GOD was in CHRIST reconciling the world unto Himself."[2] Thus it was that the sympathy of the SON with the FATHER'S will was manifested in the self-sacrifice of His Incarnation, Life and Death, and was consummated in His Resurrection, Ascension and Pentecostal gift of the SPIRIT. But throughout all the FATHER'S love was immanent in the work of His SON, inspiring and directing and encouraging. "Believe Me that I am in the FATHER, and the FATHER in Me."[3] It is not strange that the FATHER loved One Who was so completely at one with Him in spirit and in truth; but it is strange that men fail to love One Who was as perfectly one with man as He was one with GOD in Spirit, One Who identified Himself as completely with human weakness as He did with the Divine confession.

Such an Atonement is not a scholastic dogma, but a living truth, not a compromise with human failings, but a Divine conciliation, conferring that pardon which is peace and that forgiveness which gives forth new life. It

[1] See Dr. Tennant's "Origin and Propagation of Sin," p. 135.
[2] 2 Cor. v. 19. [3] John xiv. 11.

is not a payment of a debt due to GOD'S honour, or to the ideal law of righteousness,[1] but it is the joint outcome of the love of the FATHER for His children, and of the sympathy of the well-beloved SON, on the one hand, with the FATHER'S righteousness and love, and, on the other, with the needs and sorrows of His brethren, whom He stooped to raise and make fit for the kingdom of Heaven.

The death of CHRIST was not, then, a proof of the FATHER'S displeasure, but of the SON'S obedience. He died because He was at one with the FATHER; and His complete renunciation of self is the entrance to a higher life for man.

Thus we see in the Cross of CHRIST a representation of the righteousness of GOD; a manifestation of the love of GOD; and an outpouring of the grace of GOD. The isolation of righteousness—which the Saviour endured for man—in its death to sin and self, and the example of His undying love, have power to act upon every human soul, and to bring the most hardened to a sense of the beauty of self-sacrifice, thus fulfilling His own words, "And I, if I be lifted up, shall draw all men unto Myself." Thus man is brought back to the FATHER'S home, the FATHER'S heart, and the FATHER'S law by the SON'S manifestation of the righteous love of that FATHER, pre-eminently in His Cross and Passion, in which love inexpressible, law ineffable, grace inexhaustible, met in a self-realisation that was to issue in the new spiritual life of man.

The transcendent triumph of the Cross consisted in its love; its sublime majesty lay in its passion; its supreme efficacy rested in its grace. A process carried on within the circle of Godhead could not affect the heart of human life unless it could touch and move it. But this process has acted upon all human life from the centre to the utmost round, because it can touch, move, and restore.

[1] See Dale, "Theory of Atonement," p. 357.

And it does all three because it commends itself to our reason, our conscience, and our hearts. To our reason because the law which was broken by, and unrealised in, man was fulfilled in letter and in spirit; to our conscience because the universal need of purity was satisfied by the removal of the hindrance to our life and communion with GOD; and to our hearts because our love has been stirred to respond. Thus the self-love of man has been changed into man's love of GOD, the final cause of that Atonement of which the first cause was GOD'S love of man. Such an Atonement, based on the FATHER'S love, holy, just and self-sacrificing, is an inspiration to all. In the eloquent words of Sir Oliver Lodge, "The perception of something in the Universe which not only makes for righteousness, but which loves and sympathises in the process, and yet is no indiscriminate charity—but a true benevolence, which healthily and strongly, and, if need be, sternly convinces him that the path of duty is the path of joy, that sacrifice and not selfishness is the road to the heights of existence, that it is far better to suffer wrong than to do wrong—such a perception inevitably raises man far above "the yelp of the beast," "saves" him, saves him truly from æons of degradation, and enables him to "stand on the heights of this life with a glimpse of a height that is higher."[1] In such a conception there is an efficacy that exalts and redeems. But the Atonement is more than a conception, though less than a consummation. It is a continuous process, not a completed act. The Sacrifice of the Death of CHRIST is a completed act; but the self-sacrificing life and love of GOD in CHRIST is but gradually unfolded in the soul that develops in Him. "If we walk in the light as He is in the light, the blood of JESUS CHRIST His SON cleanseth us from all sin."[2] The Way to the FATHER'S heart is for all. "The wayfaring, though fools, shall not err therein."[3]

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 233. [2] 1 John i. 7. [3] Isa. xxxv. 8.

CHAPTER IV

THE MEANS OF THE ATONEMENT: MEDIATION AND THE MEDIATOR.

"For there is one Mediator between GOD and man, the man CHRIST JESUS, Who gave Himself a ransom for (ὑπέρ) all" (1 Tim. ii. 5).

"Fidelissimus sequester Dei et hominum qui et homini Deum et hominem Deo reddet" (Tert., "De Res.," 63).

Is there any testimony in the universal experience of man to the fact of the Atonement which may make it intelligible to us? We have already seen that the Cross as we looked at it from the Divine standpoint was a manifestation of the love, the righteousness, and the grace of GOD. But as we consider it from the human point of view, if it is to be brought into line with human experience, it must have been more than the glorification of self-sacrifice, more than a moving sermon on repentance, more than a manifestation of love. The conception of CHRIST as lawgiver or teacher,[1] in Whom all three might be expressed, is an insufficient basis for such an Atonement as the New Testament sets forth, inasmuch as it deprives the death of CHRIST of its real significance, and mankind of the assurance of that forgiveness, the universal need of which is its *raison d'être* in the life of humanity as the universal love of GOD is its *raison d'être* in the life of Deity. But this forgiveness cannot be mediated to us by any arrangement or transaction external to the life of man. A Divine

[1] Harnack, "History of Dogma," ii. 294, points out the insufficiency of this view, which was held by Hippolytus ("Philos.," x. 34).

arrangement to meet the necessity of man cannot be external to the life it would influence. Such an arrangement, which the schoolmen call *satisfaction*, would be powerless to raise or redeem the sinner's life if it could not touch that life within, if it could not give a new heart, a new power, a new motive to work and a new object to work for. The Atonement is not a scheme of deliverance; it is a process of recovery through the fellowship of the Divine SPIRIT with the human spirit. It is pardon and peace for the broken sinful heart in CHRIST—"the most faithful Mediator between GOD and man, Who restores GOD to man and man to GOD," "the one Mediator between GOD and man, the Man CHRIST JESUS," Who being one with GOD and one with man is able to set up that process of change in the inner life of man which is continued so far as that life is hid with CHRIST in GOD. As Irenæus wrote: "It behoved that the Mediator of GOD and man, through His kinship or affinity with both, should lead both into love and harmony, and present man to GOD and reveal GOD to man."[1] A mere transaction between two Divine persons could not bring about such an inner change in man's life. Nor could there be aught of the nature of a transaction when the will of the SON moved in perfect harmony with the will of the FATHER, and by one SPIRIT. GOD was in CHRIST reconciling the world unto Himself. The spiritual union of the FATHER and the SON was the living basis of the Atonement; their living union was the secret of its attractive and motive power.[2]

The parable of the Prodigal Son is the SON'S parable of the FATHER'S reconciliation, in which many see no atonement, no mediation of forgiveness. There is indeed naught here suggestive of an arrangement between the FATHER and the SON by which the SON consented to be offered as a sacrifice to appease the FATHER'S wrath, and

[1] "Adv. Hær.," iii. 18, 7. [2] John xvii. 11, 21, 23, 26.

to satisfy His vigorous demand that a life should be given and blood should be shed for the remission of sins. In the elder brother we hear the voice of the law, in the FATHER the voice of love proving stronger than the law, superseding the legal consequences of it in order to allow play for His Divine grace. The parable teaches that, though there is no legal absolution, the FATHER'S "Absolvo te" relieves from guilty fears, redeems from evil habits and restores to new life.

All this has been set forth. It has also been stated that the SON Himself did not remove any obstacle in Deity to our forgiveness or change the attitude of GOD to man from one of hostility to one of pity; but He overcame obstacles in man to GOD'S grace, by convincing man of GOD'S love, His readiness to forgive, His holiness and the power of His Spirit. He thus acts as the Representative of GOD to man and as the Representative of man to GOD.

The principle involved in such representation is mediation—which enters largely into human experience, and into the Scriptural account of that experience. It underlies the whole Jewish system of sacrifice and priesthood, and is due to the hesitation, which grows with the development of the sense of sin and of GOD'S holiness, to approach Him immediately without representatives. The more spiritual and less anthropopathic the conception of Deity grew, the more dissatisfied the people became with the Mosaic institutions, and the more pressing grew that demand for a mediator who should be both the servant of GOD and the saviour of man, which is expressed in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. In the Old Testament we have men interceding for their fellows with GOD—Abraham, Moses, and Samuel;[1] we find Moses offering his life for his people, as St. Paul afterwards did,[2] but in no case is

[1] 1 Sam. vii. 5.

[2] Rom. ix. 3: "For I would wish that myself were anathema from CHRIST for my brethren."

there that perfect mediation which implies adequate representation of the Divine to the human and of the human to the Divine.[1] The principle that is embodied by the mediator is self-sacrifice. The words of Isaiah,[2] "He hath borne our sicknesses and carried our sorrows"; "Thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin"; "And He did bear the sins of many, and for transgressors doth He make intercession," are not only a description of vicarious suffering, but a testimony to the belief in the atoning efficacy of such suffering.

The question is: What did such mediation involve in the case of our LORD? That mediation is described by the New Testament writers in the analogies and metaphors that were to hand in the Old Testament. The Jew who found forgiveness and salvation in CHRIST conceived

[1] In the Apocrypha the idea of mediation falls into the background; and wherever a mediator is mentioned he is superhuman—*e.g.*, Tob. xii. 15 (Raphael); 2 Macc. xv. 12, 15 (Onias). In the Pseudepigrapha especial prominence is given to angelic mediation—*e.g.*, Michael in the Book of Enoch. In the Targums, or Aramaic paraphrases of the Hebrew Scriptures, we have semi-Divine beings as intermediaries between GOD and man, such as Metatron, Memra, or Word—*e.g.*, Targum to Isa. lvi. 13: "My *Memra* shall be unto thee for a redeeming deity"; and to Zech. xii.: "In the *Memra* redemption will be found"—Shekhinah and HOLY SPIRIT. In the Jewish Prayer-Books the *'Akedah*, or binding of Isaac, is appealed to, and the Messiah, as in the Targums, figures as a mediating agent. The *Torah*, or the law, almsgiving, repentance, works, prayer, fasting, suffering, and death, are also treated in Rabbinical literature as mediating agencies. On the other hand, there is negative teaching in the Old Testament—*e.g.*, 1 Sam. ii. 25: "If a man sinneth against Jehovah, who can intercede for him?" Job ix. 33: "Oh that there were a mediator between us!" and in the Jerusalem Talmud ("Berakh," ix. 1, R.) Judah is quoted as saying: "Appeals to the Almighty in times of trouble do not depend on the angels Michael or Gabriel; one need only call upon GOD"; and in the *Zohar:* "We depend not on a man, nor do we trust in a Son-GOD, but in the GOD of heaven, Who is the true GOD"—apropos of which remark in *Sanhedrin*, 92b, an angel cries out after Nebuchadnezzar's remark concerning the SON of GOD, "Has GOD a Son?" (see further Oesterley's "Jewish Doctrine of Mediation").

[2] Isa. liii. 4, 10, 12.

his experience as a redemption and his Redeemer as the passover sacrificed for him, just as the Christian who had received life in CHRIST felt as if an old quarrel had been made up, an old debt paid, an old burden removed. Something had been done for them and in them which they felt incapable of expressing save in the images and metaphors of daily use, the existence of which proved that the vicarious principle entered largely into the religious thought and experience of mankind in general.

What was there in the Atonement of CHRIST which could be so represented? Apart from the emotional effect of our LORD's Cross and Passion upon us—an effect which may be described by a pupil of Aristotle as "a purging of our feelings"[1]—there was a mystery of redemption we cannot fathom involved in the mystery of iniquity. Our LORD having been manifested to destroy the works of the Devil,[2] there was some overcoming of sin, some strange conflict in "the centre of immensities, in the conflux of eternities," the result of which to man is that the light of GOD's love and the sunshine of His presence became more evident in His earthly career. That it was not the bearing of the sentence on sin—the eternal remorse of a guilty conscience—we know. That it was not anything inflicted by GOD, Who was in CHRIST reconciling the world unto Himself, we also know. That it was some mysterious suffering voluntarily borne, a suffering that was intensified by its twofold origin and its twofold object, is an explanation that yet remains. The sympathy of CHRIST as the SON of GOD, on the other hand, with the holiness and love—or rather the holy love[3]—of the FATHER, and the sympathy of CHRIST as the Son of Man, on the other hand, with the sorrow-laden, sin-bearing condition of His

[1] Aristotle, "Poet.," 2: "Tragedy is an imitation . . . through pity and fear accomplishing a purification (*κάθαρσιν*) of such feelings."

[2] 1 John iii. 5, 8.

[3] True love (*ἀγάπη*) is holy, while passion (*ἔρως*) is not always pure.

brethren, constituted at once His fitness to be our Mediator, and explains the vicarious principle in the Atonement, which may be generally described as a suffering with us, because of us, on behalf of us, and, in a sense, in our stead.[1] This very sympathy with suffering was a Divine element. As it is found among men it recalls the divinity of man. As it was manifested in CHRIST it reveals the Deity. As Sir Oliver Lodge writes, "The sin of the creature involves the suffering of the Creator."[2] GOD is really GOD to the modern philosopher because He is a suffering, sympathising, loving GOD, Who, because of His love, bears the sins and sorrows of men, and because of His holiness sanctifies the hearts that are united with Him. The sympathy and holy love of JESUS shown in His treatment of the sick[3] and sinful prove that He grappled with those very problems of human life with which Deity must be primarily concerned, as only the SON of GOD could. We could never feel the same aversion from the evil in man, the same sympathy with the holiness of GOD, the same yearning for the salvation of man, the same pity for the sorrows and erring condition of humanity which constituted a pathetic appeal, nay, with all reverence be it spoken, an irresistible claim on the Divine GOD of love and holiness to save, redeem and restore His own creatures, and in so doing to assert His own righteousness and to manifest His own love. As the great and crucial thing must be done in GOD, and not before Him, by GOD, and not for Him, the SON, being the Word of GOD, Who was with GOD and Who was GOD, felt GOD'S responsibility to

[1] It being impossible to build up a theory of the Atonement upon an interpretation of any one of the prepositions ὑπέρ, περί, ἀντί, to the exclusion of the others, the above grouping appears more comprehensive and expressive than the simple "for."

[2] "Man and the Universe," p. 267.

[3] St. Matt. viii. 17 refers the passage of Isa. liii. 4—"He hath borne our sicknesses and carried our sorrows"—to our LORD'S healing the sick.

the race, and being the Son of Man, Who had taken our nature upon Himself, accepted *the race's responsibility to* GOD. Such sympathy causing a conflict of emotions and feelings in the SAVIOUR'S heart was its keenest torture. It was no penal infliction or legal condemnation, but the real taking of the Weltschmerz upon His soul, the real bearing of the agony of a world weary of its sin, and the real participation in the grief of the FATHER mourning over His sinning children. This was the crown of His sufferings. In Gethsemane and on the Cross, the veil is moved aside and the Holy One is revealed as He feels the weight of human misery and sin in His pure, loving soul; not merely as He realises the cruelty and cunning, the hypocrisy and hatred of Jewish puritan and priest, but also as He sounds the depths of degradation into which sin had hurled humanity—that black abyss of unnamed, unspeakable horrors, that might cause a less lofty soul to curse the race and die, but which made Him feel, not the hopelessness of man, but the godlessness of sin, and all the more determined to annihilate the cause of GOD'S grief and man's misery. In this way He experienced the effects of sin, not by proxy, as a moved spectator of a tragedy, but as the principal sufferer in its moving scenes.

It is the presence of such a Mediator, as He stands before us with all the marks of His suffering, that makes our religion what it is—catholic and cosmic—the one and only hope of erring humanity, because it exhibits on a cosmic scale the principle of mediation which redeems and atones. That principle is world-wide. The sins and sorrows of one generation are connected with the sins and sorrows of another. The whole life of humanity is so bound together that what affects the individual must affect the many—that sickness here means pain there,[1] just as

[1] This has been well put by Sir Oliver Lodge: "The whole of existence is so bound together that disease in one part means pain

the slightest movement in the physical world affects the whole material universe. This explains the vicariousness of suffering. In the world of action and suffering the innocent always suffer for, and with, the guilty. This may not be just, but it is natural and inevitable as long as the conditions of human life are what they are. It is an incontestable fact that love, when bestowed upon an unworthy object, brings pain and shame. Love gives itself freely and fully, never asking "What is the advantage?" or "How is it to end?" but "What can I give?" "What can I do?" It never counts the cost or the pang, and there is always a cost, always a pang. It costs a father or mother much to bring home an erring child. That is the price of their love. "The son of such tears cannot be lost," said a venerable bishop to Monica, the mother of Augustine. How often do Christian workers bring comfort and help to others in trouble, sorrow, or sickness, oftentimes the consequences of wickedness or carelessness, with the result that they contract the diseases or impoverish themselves! That is the price of their sympathy. Love always pays; it never asks "To whom?" or "To what law?" And yet men inquire, "To whom did CHRIST pay the ransom?" It is natural, and therefore to some extent reasonable, that love should pay, even to the uttermost farthing. Were it to withhold its help and crush its sympathy, its regret would be intolerable, its remorse unendurable. Here we are in touch with the great mystery of our deliverance from sin by the One Mediator, JESUS CHRIST. Every true heart experiences pain at the sight of another's woe, when unable to remove the cause of that woe. Many a time, on the spur of the moment, in response to a cry for help, men risk their lives and give their lives to save an unknown person from

throughout. This is the element of truth in the vicariousness of suffering, and in extension of suffering to the highest; but it is not vicariously penal, nor is it propitiatory" ("Man and the Universe," p. 267).

death. This is a veritable dying on their behalf—in their stead. How frequently is the cry heard, as the mourner stands by the bier of his beloved, "Would GOD I had died for thee!" The hope of human redemption lies in such a spirit. How often, when uttering words of sympathy—which seem so unavailing—to those enduring poignant remorse for sin, have men longed to free them from the burden that pressed them down—a burden nothing in this world can remove! For no consolation that man can offer can cause his brother-man to forget his shortcomings or the rebuking tones of his conscience, or lift the load of sin from the wearied life, or sweeten the poisoned waters of the soul, or remove his guilt. But yet there is the desire in every human-hearted man to bear the burden of sin and sorrow that crushes his neighbour. Even in our imperfect human conditions we can conceive a perfectly human character prepared to undergo untold suffering of soul and body to save one he loved from his sin. Such sympathy in the case of a kinsman or one dearly loved, who has erred, is a vicarious penitence which may lead to the contrition and salvation of the sinner. Parental sternness may harden a child; but in parental sorrow there is hope for his return. The sight of the innocent suffering the consequences of his sin, and enduring them without repinings or reproaches, has in certain circumstances a peculiar saving influence over the guilty. The sense of his sin is awakened when he perceives how it saddens and grieves those who love him, and the door of a new life is opened for the sinner.

Such mediation and its restoring influence are a witness in the deepest experience of humanity to the fact of an Atonement which makes the formula that expresses it intelligible to man.[1] For in an ideal case of such vicarious

[1] "If there were no witness in the world's deeper literature to the fact of an Atonement, the Atonement would be useless, since the formula expressing it would be unintelligible" (Robertson Nicoll).

penitence, to which the highest imaginable human instance can merely approximate, identification of the sympathiser with the sinner would be complete and his mediation perfect—as it was in the case of the Son of Man, Who was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of GOD in Him.[1] The instinct that impels a man to put himself in danger for his brother's sake is neither new nor unnatural, being rooted in our constitution, deep as the mother's heart, true as the mother's love.[2] We all owe our life to the sufferings of others; we all owe our education and upbringing to the self-denying and fostering care of others. Our shortcomings and weaknesses have wrung the bosom of those who are dearest to us. The sorrow we have inflicted on them has perhaps worked repentance in us.

Others, then, have suffered for us, because of us, and even in our stead, and so it is natural, if not just, that in certain circumstances we should suffer for, because of, and in the stead of, others. Our human nature impels us to do it, our conscience smites us if we refuse. Does the swimmer who allows his fellow-man to sink in the river, or the traveller who forsakes his fever-stricken companion in an African forest, suffer no pangs of remorse? Does the man who, like the priest or Levite in the parable, passes by a fallen man on the other side, carry an easy conscience? This were not to be expected, seeing that they have transgressed one of the GOD of Nature's dearest laws—that men should suffer for and with another. And if men are unconsciously impelled to suffer

[1] 2 Cor. v. 21.

[2] "To love anyone really, truly, means that we are putting ourselves in his place; that, loving him as ourselves, that we desire for him the best, and give up ourselves and our own pleasure in order to secure it for him. This is true love, and wherever you find it, you find a spark of GOD. That is why mothers are so much nearer GOD than anyone else. They love more—that is, they are more like GOD. It is they who keep the earth from becoming a vast hell" ("Letters from Julia").

for and with others, how much more would the true Man, the Son of Man, the Representative of the race, share this common feeling and desire? Human analogies are woefully deficient, but in some cases they give a useful lead to those who are following up Divine principles. And that they can be employed with telling effect is proved by the noble outburst of David in Browning's "Saul":

"Would I suffer for him that I love? So wouldst thou—so wilt thou!
So shall crown thee the topmost, ineffablest, uttermost crown;
And thy love fill infinitude wholly, nor leave up nor down
One spot for the creature to stand in!"

But is this law of nature just? We can only answer that it is natural, that it is not an arbitrary arrangement, but a world-wide principle as deep and broad as the heart of humanity. This principle, therefore, justified itself because of its universal nature,[1] as it is justified by reason of its end. For it tends to vindicate the authority of GOD'S law, to minimise human suffering, and to express the solidarity of mankind.[2]

In the human world—not to speak of the sub-human with its sacrifices and its justice—we cannot but remark how far-reaching and how much including is this vicarious principle. Men suffer for others, because of the sins of others, and in the place of others, all the world over. On the one hand, the mother often gives her life for her child, and the father is not infrequently worked to death for his family; and, on the other hand, the children suffer for the failings of their parents. The children of careless and dissolute people inherit frames already diseased, and tendencies to evil—the heirloom of sin; while the sons and

[1] This is quite on the lines of the categorical imperative of Kant: "Act as if the maxim of thy action were to become by thy will a universal law." Kant recognised the moral bearing of catholicity. He also had regard to teleological considerations in his discussion on ends which are also duties—*i.e.*, my own perfection and the happiness of others.

[2] Herbert Spencer, "Justice," pp. 15 *et seq.*

daughters of dishonourable parents pass their life under a cloud—the patrimony of disgrace. So CHRIST suffered in Himself the consequences of the sin of His people as they rolled back upon Him through His original connection and organic union with the race. Furthermore, in the outer world of will and work, much depends upon our environment, the society in which we live and move. It is a fact that the one is often called upon to die for the many, the individual for the society, and that the welfare of the few is subservient to the welfare of the greatest number.

Mr. Herbert Spencer in his "Justice" has handled this subject in an instructive manner, showing that even in the animal kingdom the law of relation between conduct and consequence is largely qualified by "that self-subordination needed among the higher animals for the rearing of offspring."[1] But "justice in its universal, simple form," he goes on to show, "is further qualified in a small degree by the partial or complete sacrifice of individuals made in defence of the species."[2]

It is only in this sense of self-subordination, putting oneself in the place of others, of suffering for others, of sympathising with others, not in the mere meaning of feeling with, for sympathy is not complete until it has passed from feeling into action, that we can use the term substitution, which is simply the concrete form of that altruism which will cause that, even when conflicts of interest cease, we shall all be members one of another, and instead of each bearing the consequences of his own deeds and nature, that when one suffers the others will suffer with him.

This is a simple account of the vicarious principle in life, embodied in the sacrifice of the patriot for his country, expressed in its most perfect form in the mediatorial, atoning work of CHRIST, Who suffered as the one for the all, and Who immortalised that principle in His death.

[1] Herbert Spencer, "Justice," p. 15. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

We do not understand how it was that this self-sacrifice of CHRIST was efficacious. Nor is it natural that we should expect to comprehend what is as profound as the mind of GOD, and as deep as the heart of GOD—GOD'S plan for man's salvation. It is sufficient that we should know the practical results of this scheme without attempting to analyse its Divine mechanism, the way it works. It is not necessary for everyone who travels by rail to understand the mechanical construction and working principle of the engine. It is sufficient for the ordinary passenger that the engine can draw the train to its destination, and to believe that it will do so in his case. The very exercise of walking, involving dependence upon the reality and permanency of the external world, is an act of faith. In such matters that lie beyond the average mind of man, as well as in those things that infinitely transcend the greatest human intellect,

"We have but faith, we cannot know."

One thing, however, is very clear to the ordinary mind of man, and that is that any system of philosophy or religion which aims at raising the nature of man, as Christianity does, must first free him from that which drags him down—sin. There is no remedy for man's nature unless sin can be destroyed, for sin is the root of all his ill. And sin may be rightly defined as anything in the will of man that opposes the Will of GOD, anything in the mind and purpose of man that is not in perfect unison with His Mind and Purpose. Accordingly, as sin has disturbed those harmonious relations in which man was intended to live with His Creator, and which were laid down in the great utterance, "Let us make man in Our image, and after Our likeness" (that is, to grow and develop on the lines that GOD has ordained, and in the ways that GOD has set before us), that which would destroy sin, and annul its

effect in the human life and personality, must restore those broken cords of communication—the love and the faith that linked the man and the Maker. And the great Mediator, JESUS CHRIST, Who succeeded in establishing on a new and higher basis—His own risen life—the true relation and harmony between GOD and man was the GOD-Man, JESUS CHRIST. Is there anything unnatural in such a mediation? Is not he the best mediator who can best represent the interests, sentiments, and positions of the parties who are to be reconciled? And how much more perfect is the arbitration when not merely the interests and positions are represented, but when the natures and properties are represented, as those of GOD and man were in the great Mediator—the GOD-Man, JESUS CHRIST, "Who although He be GOD and Man, yet He is not two, but one CHRIST."

There remains a problem yet to be solved. Transformation of character, not transference of guilt, being the end, how did the mediation of CHRIST avail to change the morals of mankind? How can the intervention of another be relevant to the transformation of the sinner's character? How can the *de facto* unholy be made *de facto* (not *de jure*) holy? "What is required," as Dr. Moberly said,[1] "is that those particular personalities should be holy, which are, in fact, the reverse. How can the particular thing which is required be touched by the introduction of "another"? Here, if anywhere in the world, there can be no question of a fictitious transaction or an unreal imagining; here, if anywhere, whatever is not vitally and personally real is both mockery and despair." Neither logic nor human justice helps us here. But experience teaches that the friend who will *bear* is the best hope of a man's restoration, and the intervention of another is not irrelevant. And what he bears is not punishment, but the penalty of sorrow, the discipline of penitence. The more it is possible

[1] "Atonement and Personality," chap. iv., p. 75.

for this friend to identify himself with the guilty one, the more hope there is of the prodigal's return. The more it is possible for the friend to identify himself with the violated righteousness, the greater the sorrow of mind he will bear, and the greater the hope of a victorious righteousness manifesting itself in the other's life. "Do we not recognise," writes Dr. Moberly, "that the profoundest hope for the child's real change lies in the reality with which his parents enter into his grief and shame; so enter into it, on his behalf, as to win it to be in him, where in fact it was not, until it was first in them, and in him only from them?" And how much more perfectly is this mediation effected by One Who is GOD, not generically but identically—for He and the FATHER are One—and Man, not generically, but inclusively, so that His humanity was the humanity of GOD, capable of a universal relation, not in the sense of being just another specimen of humanity, but a Man Who summed up all humanity in Himself. In the Divine Unity of the Christian conception there is just that real reciprocity of mutual relations, just that mutuality of eternal knowledge and eternal love, which explains the SON'S absolute identification of His will with the FATHER'S; and this organic human unity or unity of humanity in CHRIST—the *fons et origo* of its spiritual life, the source of its solidarity, its beginning and its crown, its Head and its Consummator—explains the Son of Man's absolute identification of Himself with humanity. Accordingly, He can be no intervening "third" Who is both GOD and Man, in a very real and inclusive manner, and therefore the only true Mediator between GOD and man. "For being the Word of GOD and supreme over all, He was consequently able, and He alone, to re-create all things, and to suffer on behalf of all, and to represent all to His FATHER."[1] In His character as prophet and teacher and

[1] Athanasius, "De Incarn.," 7: *πρεσβεῦσαι περὶ πάντων.*

worker of signs He represents the descending or manward mediation, speaking for GOD, revealing His will and displaying His power to man. It is through Him, therefore, that GOD approached man. In His character as the High Priest of humanity He represents the ascending or Godward mediation, speaking for and praying for the humanity with which He has identified Himself. It is through Him, therefore, that man approaches GOD. It is the presence of the Mediator that makes Christianity what it is. This doctrine of the Mediator, as distinguished from the mythic Christs,[1] is the differentia of our religion.

But our Mediator did not confine His work to mediation. He gave redemption to us in a way we cannot hope to understand, but we should pray to realise that He died for us and on our behalf, in order to assert the Divine law of righteousness and goodness in human life, to redeem man from the power of evil, and to show him that the vicarious instinct in his nature—that love which induces one man to put himself, even for a moment, in the place of another, and to suffer for that other—is the saving principle of the world.

For that principle as manifested by JESUS became a power of infinite extent and capability, an arch of atoning love, under the shadow of which men were made at one

[1] Plutarch ("De Iside et Osiride," chap. xlvi.) states that Mithra was called μεσίτης, because he stood midway between Ormuzd, the good principle, and Ahriman, the evil principle, an intermediary between the spirit of good and the spirit of evil. On this authority it is asserted that Mithra is a pagan Christ (J. M. Robertson, "Pagan Christs," p. 304). This glorification of Mithra, who was worshipped in connection with the infamous rites of Cybele (Cumont, "Mysteries of Mithra," Eng. Vers., p. 19), and Anahita, a lascivious Persian goddess of "fruitfulness and nutriency," is humiliating to CHRIST. An article in the *Nineteenth Century*, September, 1905, on "Mithraism," states that Mithra was in more senses than one the mediator between man and the Most High! Neither is there any trace of the taurobolium, or the rite of baptizing the devotees of Mithra with the blood of a bull, in the reference to the blood of CHRIST in the New Testament.

with their Heavenly FATHER and their human brother; a foundation-stone of the new life of concord and peace, of happiness and holiness which is in Heaven. Let us realise it. Of the fulness of His love He gave. The brightness of His glory He renounced. All He could suffer He suffered for us, that we might give up our life to Him, that we, the wayward children, might be brought back to our FATHER'S home. This was indeed "the crowning instance of that suffering of the innocent for the guilty which springs from the solidarity of mankind."[1]

Furthermore, though we be unable to grasp fully the mode or to appraise duly the manner in which the Atonement has been represented in the Scriptures, where it was expressed in Jewish metaphor and types, still, we may venture to construct our theory of that Atonement upon the great ruling ideas and principles of our LORD'S life. In the discourses of St. John, JESUS speaks of Himself as One Who can give new life here and now to His people, and Who can help them to conquer the evil in the world. Is not this the highest form of redemption—redemption of the personality from the bondage of sin? This cannot be effected by external means, neither is it due to the inner work of each man upon himself, but it is the inner work of the immanent CHRIST upon the life of man. And we can truly say that JESUS was redemption for us in the sense that He was in Himself the principle of our deliverance, and that He in us accomplished our deliverance. By His crowning act of self-sacrifice He also helped to sow and propagate in the hearts of His followers the principle of self-sacrifice, winning them to love the brethren and to lay down their lives for the truth. And thus man was redeemed and restored to the image and assisted to follow after the likeness of the Heavenly FATHER, the character of self-sacrificing love and of self-giving holiness.

[1] Wilson, "The Atonement," p. 64.

To recapitulate the steps of this argument:

1. The question, "Was it just of GOD to lay the sins and sufferings of the world on one man?" should be restated thus: "Was it unreasonable and unnatural for one man to suffer for others? And that one who is the representative man of the race—the Son of Man—the Head of the race—Who suffered with His Body and every member of it?"

2. The principle of mediation is world-wide. This is a mutually atoning world. Men do really suffer because of, for, and instead of others, often guilty, by force of sympathy, by horror of sin, by inheritance or sufferance of the consequences. Both Moses and St. Paul evinced this spirit. The instinct to suffer for others and to put oneself in the place of another is deep as the mother's heart, true as the mother's love. The origin of our life is through the suffering, and the maintenance of our life is through the self-denial, of others. And that self-denial, when noble and genuine, and displaying itself in a vicarious sorrow and penitence, is an uplifting force in another's life. Such mediation leads to transformation of character.

3. Nature's law is GOD'S law. GOD goes out of Himself to be Himself. He expends His love and mercy in order to realise His goodness and nature. This law is to be reproduced in GOD'S creatures. Its end is the vindication of GOD'S law and love, and the amelioration of the life of others. This is the triumph of love, for GOD is love and GOD is life. Divine love is the highest form of self-sacrifice, and so of life.

4. There is no such thing as an isolated or unrelated life. No man lives his life alone; his life is bound up with that of others. Life is impossible in any real sense apart from a society which involves a tissue of relations, influences, duties, and responsibilities. For it is only in a communion of spirits that the spirit can become self-

distinguishing and self-conscious, and self-knowledge is one of the elements that lead to "sovereign power." All mankind is, in the idea of GOD and potentiality, one at heart, one community bound together by invisible ties, governed by spiritual laws, swayed by the same spiritual emotions. No man liveth to himself. This truth, latent in every heart, becomes patent when the Fatherhood of one and the same GOD is recognised.

5. This explains the vicarious principle in its universal aspect. The life of humanity is so bound together that (*a*) *the one suffers for the many*. What affects the many affects the one, so much so that the one is often called upon, and is willing and even seeks to die for the many, the preservation of the society in Church or State being a larger good than the preservation of the individual. This principle is embodied in the patriot and reformer, and was manifested in the highest form in the mediatorial and atoning work of CHRIST, Who suffered the One for the many, the Head for the Body. "This is My blood of the New Testament, which is shed for *many* for the remission of sins" (*many* is contrasted with the one) (Matt. xxvi. 28).

(*b*) Again, what affects the one affects the many, so that *the many suffer for the one*. This is the correlative or counterpart of the one suffering for the many, and is equally true of human life in society. When the doings or interests of the individual are opposed to that of the community, in a lower stage the individual is removed (destroyed); but in a higher stage the society—*e.g.*, the Church—suffers for the individual, in order that his soul may be saved in the day of the LORD. And when the doings or interests of the individual have proved beneficial to the community, they show their joy in honouring him, and their sympathy in sharing his sorrows.

6. This, then, is the great lesson that CHRIST has

taught humanity, with a light and clearness that make it easy for the simplest understanding—namely, that a life of self-sacrifice is the highest and noblest life, the likest GOD of all. For self-sacrifice does not originate with man; it emanates from GOD. The law that a higher life is only through loss of much that precedes,[1] and that death to self and ambition is the condition of life and glory, was perfectly exemplified in CHRIST. "FATHER, glorify Thy Name," He said, knowing that the path to that glory lay in His own suffering and humiliated life. Such was the spirit in which He mediated and offered His life as sacrifice. And that spirit wrought the Atonement. And in His sacrifice we participate when we are renewed by the indwelling Spirit of Him that offered it.

7. Accordingly, the greatest results flow from His mediation to the race of man, because it was as the Representative of man and as the SON of GOD that He mediated. He was the Word of GOD, co-equal and co-essential with the FATHER. He was the SON of GOD, a distinct Person from the FATHER, loving and obedient, and He became the Son of Man—still the same Person, emptied of glory, under new conditions—in order that He might become the one Mediator between GOD and man. For this rôle He was uniquely qualified, peculiarly fit. For as GOD, not generically but identically, He represented the perfect righteousness and will and love of GOD. Here lay the efficacy of the mediation. And as Man—not simply a man, but Man inclusively and identically—He represented human nature in its integrity. This was the ground of the mediation. As the SON of GOD He had the right to speak to man in the Name of GOD; and as Son of Man He had the right to speak to GOD in the name of man.

[1] *E.g.*, the larval characters acquired by the grub are lost when the change to the butterfly takes place.

8. He mediated (1) by interceding for us, even as the Paraclete with groanings that cannot be uttered; (2) by suffering for us, not in the sense of bearing our punishment, but in the sense of agonising and dying for us, so that we might share His risen life; (3) by quickening our life by His life, and by developing our life thus into fuller life.

9. He is our means of approach to GOD, being "the Way" as well as "the Truth and the Life." "Through Him we both" (Jews and Gentiles) "have access by one SPIRIT unto the FATHER." The sense of sin debarred us from that communion before. Now the sense of sin is overcome and the sense of holiness is imparted in the new life given to, because in the first instance given for, mankind. Thus CHRIST has made it possible that our souls should be presented blameless before GOD in the blamelessness of His SON, Who lived and died and rose again for us to redeem us from the servitude of sin, and to restore us to the service of GOD; to give us new life, and to show us, above all things, that the impulse of love, by which man is impelled to put himself in his brother's place and share his sorrow and suffering, is the saving principle of the world. That principle as manifested by JESUS became a power of infinite extent and capability—an arch, as it were, of atoning love, under the shadow of which men were made at one with their Heavenly FATHER and one with their brother-man.

CHAPTER V

IDENTIFICATION: THE SECRET OF THE ATONEMENT

"It is impossible," wrote Lotze, "to speak of GOD'S honour as receiving 'satisfaction,' through the sacrificial death of a single person, for the injury done it by the sin of man. For such a view, aside from its somewhat crude conception of GOD, is based upon the altogether impossible conception of a solidaric unity of the human race and of the possibility of a transfer of its guilt and obligation to a single representative."[1]

These words of Lotze, repudiating the popular doctrine of the Atonement, which is regarded by many since Anselm's time as a satisfaction of GOD'S honour and as involving a literal transfer of our guilt and obligation to CHRIST, lead us to the real question to be determined: What is the relation of our LORD to those for whom He made atonement? Seeing that such a relation is crucial and cardinal to the whole subject and work of Atonement, it must be original and universal, present and eternal, immanent and representative.

In the *Expositor*,[2] Professor James Denney and Professor A. S. Peake, leading theologians of their respective schools, have recently discussed the subject of the relation of CHRIST to those for whom the Atonement is made. Professor Denney regards it as one of substitution, although

[1] "Philosophy of Religion," Eng. Trans., p. 151.

[2] Nos. xlvi. and xlix., pp. 253 *et seq.* of former; pp. 60 *et seq.* of latter.

he points out the misconstruction to which the term lends itself, disclaims "an interpretation of personal relations which makes use only of sub-personal categories," and recognises that "merit and demerit cannot be mechanically transferred like sums in an account." On the other hand, he asserts, that in spite of these drawbacks which attach to the word, "there is something in the work of CHRIST, as mediating the forgiveness of sins, which no other word can express. No matter on what subsequent conditions its virtue for us depends, what CHRIST did had to be done, or we should never have had forgiveness; we should never have known GOD, and His nature and will in relation to sin; we should never have had the motive which alone could beget real repentance; we should never have had the spirit which welcomes pardon and is capable of receiving it. We could not procure these things for ourselves; we could not produce them out of our own resources; but He, by entering into our nature and lot, by taking on Him our responsibilities and dying our death, has so revealed GOD to us as to put them within our reach. We owe them to Him; in particular, and in the last resort, we owe them to the fact that He bore our sins in His own body on the tree. If we are not to say that the Atonement, as a work carried through in the sufferings and death of CHRIST, sufferings and death determined by our sin, is vicarious or substitutionary, what are we to call it?" [1]

Such is Dr. Denney's own position. He regards our LORD as our substitute, not in the sense that His merit was transferred to our account and our punishment to Him, but in the sense that He obtained something for us by His vicarious sufferings and death that we could not procure of ourselves, the knowledge of GOD'S mind towards sin, the motive, thence arising, of repentance and the spirit that welcomes pardon.

[1] *Expositor*, No. xlvi., p. 253.

What seems defective to us in Dr. Denney's view is his laying all the emphasis on the moral and external relation of CHRIST to the race. The phrase on which he builds—"without CHRIST"[1]—simply refers to lack of Christian privileges, not to the fact that "to begin with we are *not* one with Him."[2]

On the other hand, Professor Peake regards our LORD as our Representative and His death as a racial act. "To the eye of GOD," he writes, "the death of CHRIST presents itself less as an act which CHRIST does for the race than as an act which the race does in CHRIST."[3] He adduces the words "the head of every man in CHRIST"[4] in support of CHRIST'S universal headship of the race, a headship "to begin with," and he cites the passages, "It is no longer I that live, but CHRIST liveth in me"[5]—in which St. Paul conceives his own personality as merged in that of CHRIST, but which Dr. Denney interpreted as simply meaning, "my life is no longer mine"[6]—and "he that is joined to the LORD is one SPIRIT,"[7] in support of the view of a mystical union with CHRIST. If there is no such phrase as "mystical union" in the New Testament, as Professor Denney remarks with something akin to exultation,[8] there is no such phrase as "moral union," but there are many passages, such as the first, fifteenth, and seventeenth chapters of St. John, the first of Colossians, Hebrews ii. 11-17, and many expressions such as "He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in GOD, and GOD in him,"[9] and "Your life is hid with CHRIST in GOD,"[10] which imply, nay, which have no significance apart from the mystical and spiritual union of the SON and the FATHER and of the

[1] Eph. ii. 12: χωρὶς Χριστοῦ.
[2] *Expositor*, No. xlvi., p. 254.
[3] *Ibid.*, No. xlvi., p. 253.
[4] *Ibid.*, No. xlix., p. 59.
[5] Gal. ii. 20.
[6] "The Death of Christ," p. 151.
[7] 1 Cor. vi. 17.
[8] *Expositor*, No. xlvi., p. 255.
[9] 1 John iv. 16.
[10] Col. iii. 3.

SON and His people. The very expression "body,"[1] as applied by St. Paul to the Church of CHRIST, and that of the "vine"[2] applied by the LORD to Himself in relation to His people as the branches, signifies an original, intimate, immanent, abiding relationship, in which He stands as the indwelling source and constitutive principle of human life, the Alpha and the Omega of moral and spiritual existence, the Author and consummator of humanity, the explanation and the goal of human problems, hopes and ideals, in reference to Whom all things have been planned, in connection with Whom humanity "coheres,"[3] and in spiritual union with Whom man develops after the likeness of GOD. If it is not a mystical union that St. Paul refers to when he wrote "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with CHRIST in GOD. When CHRIST, Who is our life, shall be manifested, then shall ye also be manifested with Himself in glory," it is certainly a union that can be best appreciated by the introspective, intuitional and contemplative type of mind which is called mystic, because it dwells, as it were, with closed eyes, upon the inner vision, and as opposed to the sacramental type of mind, feels the Divine Presence in the inner movements of the spirit, finds GOD directly and independently of external forms, however they may suggest the spiritual, within the soul; and as distinguished from the "moral" type finds the secret of the Christian life in the spiritual and inner communion of GOD and man rather that in a purely ethical[4] and external relation.

Again, it is not "a fantastic abstraction" to speak of the Atonement as a "racial act,"[5] when such is the view put forward in the Epistle to the Romans,[6] where the repre-

[1] Col. i. 18: "He is the head of the body, the Church."
[2] John xv. [3] Col. i. 17.
[4] It is, however, questionable if the ethical can be explained apart from the immanent and the spiritual.
[5] Denney, *Expositor*, No. xlvi., p. 254.
[6] Rom. v. 12-21. *Cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 22, 47; 1 Cor. xi. 3: "The head of every man is CHRIST."

sentative character of Adam is pointed out to be vastly inferior to the unique spiritual relationship in which CHRIST stands to the race. Irenæus and Athanasius perceived the drift of the Apostle's argument. The former wrote: "It behoved Him Who essayed to destroy sin and to redeem man, who was guilty of sin, to become that very thing which he was, namely, man, who had been enslaved by sin, but was held by death, so that sin might be slain by *man*, and man might go free."[1] Here our LORD'S action is described as representative. What CHRIST did for man, man did in Him, or rather, what He did was done by the race in Him, because He was the true head and recapitulation of the race.[2] And the latter sets forth the representative relation of the Logos to mankind in such passages as: "On the ground that all men died in Him, He annulled the law of corruption affecting man";[3] "And by virtue of our incorporation with Him, His Divine energy immanent in man is able to save man from corruption."[4]

Neither is there any trace of forensic imputation in the passage of Augustine,[5] where, in virtue of His organic union with us, He is said to be "sin that we might be righteousness, not our own, but the righteousness of GOD; not in us, but in Him, just as He was made sin, not His own, but ours, not inherent in Him, but in us." For, as Ambrose said, "He condemned sin, which at His birth He did not perceive in Himself, but in His death He crucified in us."[6]

[1] "Adv. Haer.," iii. 18, 7.

[2] *Ibid.*, 21, 10, where our LORD is described as the "recapitulation" of Adam, or humanity: "Ita recapitulans in se Adam ipse Verbum existens, ex Maria quæ adhuc erat Virgo recte accipiebat generationem Adæ recapitulationis." *Cf.* iii. 22, 1: "Verbum Dei suum plasma in semetipsum recapitulans."

[3] "De Incarn.," chap. vii.

[4] *Ibid.*, ix.: διὰ τὸν ἐνοικήσαντα Λόγον.

[5] "Enchiridion," chap. xiii.

[6] "Damnavit peccatum quod nascendo non sensit in se, moriendo crucifixit in nobis."

How far short of this spiritual kinship, this mystical relation and union of CHRIST and His Church, as set forth in the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, is the conception of Anselm, whose treatment of the Atonement is as mechanical as his presentation of the relations between GOD and CHRIST and CHRIST and man is external! Greatly inferior is the position of one who held that GOD'S honour can only be satisfied by the payment of "something greater than all which is outside GOD"[1] to that of him who wrote: "A judgment upon man alone could have destroyed him, and a judgment borne by GOD alone would be *manqué*, it would be wide of the mark, as being irrelevant to man's experience and regeneration. But borne by GOD in man, in such a racial, nay, cosmic experience as the Cross of CHRIST, it is the creation of a new conscience, and of the new ethic of the race. When CHRIST died, all died. Dying with CHRIST is not a mere ethical idea, complete only as we succeed in doing it. It is a religious or mystic idea, which is ethical as taking effect in a holy act. The judgment involved . . . is in us according as we are in Him; yet not as a judgment, but as a grace; not as a punishment, but as salvation; not as a scourge, but as a cross."[2]

On philosophical grounds the relation of CHRIST to the race is, accordingly, the basis of His work; and also the fundamental conception of the doctrine of His work. It is not enough that He should have perfect kinship with the race. He must have some claim to represent it, some power to unify it, some reason to own and govern it. Otherwise He would not possess that spiritual headship of the race which is not only the explanation of the ethical solidarity of the race, but also of the spiritual solidarity of the race, in Him. Accordingly, His relationship to the race

[1] "Cur Deus Homo," ii. 6.
[2] Principal Forsyth, "Cruciality of the Cross," p. 53.

is dependent on His relation to the FATHER, Whose children "best and worst are we," and involves the essential relation of the nature of man to the nature of GOD.

As the only SON of the FATHER, the unique SON, the ideal, original and essential SON, in Whom sonship in GOD is ideally, originally and essentially revealed, He is the first of all His Sons, the firstborn among many brethren,[1] the head of the human family, Who represents to men their filial relationship to GOD in all its perfection, fulness and universality, even the Divine in man. And as the Son of Man—a phrase unquestionably used in a representative manner by our LORD Himself—He represents humanity before GOD as its true and living Head, Who is affected by everything that affects His body, feeling its sins and its sorrows, even as the head of the physical body is the interpreter of its needs, the sufferer in its pains. And thus He represents the human in the Divine. To use a simple analogy, every organism requires a head, and evolves in the direction of such a product. Its highest point of development is attained in the evolution of a head, an initiating, synthesising, controlling faculty. So the culmination of its development was reached by the organism of humanity when its Head was made manifest as the originating, unifying, guiding and explanatory principle of the Body, whose true life is realised in the "growing up of all things into union with Him Who is the Head, even CHRIST." Without such a Head there is no ethical cohesion, no intellectual explanation of the race. Anarchy prevails wherever that Head is not obeyed, Who is the supreme fact of human history, and in this practical sense its rightful Head. Confusion of thought prevails wherever He is not recognised Who is the revelation and realisation of the end towards which the whole creation moves, and in this philosophical sense is its only Head. The end of

[1] Rom. viii. 29.

human existence cannot be realised while men hold not the Head.[1] But just so far as men realise their true relation to CHRIST as the members of a body of which He alone is the true Head, so far they realise the end and object of their existence—the image and the likeness of GOD—sonship in GOD—being conformed to the image of His SON.[2] The possibilities of such sonship are revealed to Men by Him of Whom Dr. Jowett said: "Of every act of kindness and good they do to others, His life is the type; of every act of devotion and self-denial, His death is the type; of every act of faith, His resurrection is the type."

But He is more than a type. His life and death were the creation of a new conscience for the race. Dying with Him is not a mere ethical idea; it is a religious fact and a mystical conception. And we can establish this principle by the following argument: That humanity is one body; that it is an organic whole, bound together by the principle of solidarity, is a fact that we cannot disguise from ourselves. What affects the many must affect the one, and what affects the one must affect the many. As Dr. Dale said: "It is this law of interdependence, this vital union of men with each other, which underlies the darkest mysteries and the divinest glories of the moral universe. We are not isolated individuals, but members of a race. We cannot dissolve our relations to mankind. It is not true, without qualification, that we have our life and character and destiny in our own hands. We are involved in all the sins and follies of past generations, and their wisdom and virtue are ours. . . . Christian theology has steadily refused to acknowledge that there can be any

[1] Rom. viii. 29.

[2] Col. ii. 19: "Not holding the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of GOD."

real separation between the individual and the life and fortunes of the race."[1]

Another fact equally apparent is this: that as the body requires a head, humanity is imperfect without One in Whom its manifold nature is summed up; its multitudinous aims and interests are concentrated; its highest ideals are realised. When humanity holds fast the Head "from Whom the whole body, by joints and bands receiving nourishment, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of GOD,"[2] there will be an harmonious co-operation of all the members, and consequently a perfect movement of the whole in the direction of its grand goal —the consummation of humanity in GOD, just as the human body, the most sensitive of all organisms when sound, is the most delicately constituted and most wonderfully adjusted automobile in existence, because each organ, while performing its own functions, works with the rest in perfect harmony—holding fast the head, and consequently maintaining the physical health and strength of the whole organism. And as the vital processes of the body are carried on in the unconscious sphere—only some internal derangement causing them to rise into consciousness—so the members of the Christian Church—the Body of CHRIST —do their best work when CHRIST takes the place of self and they merge or lose themselves in Him, Who gave Himself for them, Who identifies Himself with them. It is the CHRIST-consciousness that unifies and saves the Body of CHRIST.

In CHRIST the race realises its end and finds its consummation, for "all things have been created unto Him." It is in the light of the end that the beginning of an organism is interpreted; for it was constituted with reference to that end. *Christus Consummator* is, therefore, the interpreter of human existence. Through the organic

[1] "Essays and Addresses," p. 103. [2] Col. ii. 19.

headship of CHRIST humanity as in CHRIST realises itself in GOD; as through the Divine and eternal Sonship of CHRIST, GOD in CHRIST realises Himself in humanity. And thus, as the source and the goal of created life, He may be said to be the constitutive principle of humanity, and the active Thought—the Divine Reason or Logos—which energises in and is expressed in the process of its evolution. The key to the position occupied by our LORD in the humanity He thus constitutes, develops, and represents, is the doctrine of Divine immanence, of which the Incarnation has been described as an intensification.[1]

To the conception of evolution modern theology owes its more spiritual conception of GOD as immanent in His work, pervading and guiding it, and revealing Himself and realising Himself in its processes and its purposes—so much grander than the conception of an artificer moulding the world from without. On the one hand, the Atonement itself, when regarded as the action of GOD in CHRIST reconciling the world unto Himself, is a principal phase in the evolution of humanity from the lowest spiritual stage, which is marked by the incipient sense of sin, to the highest spiritual stage of human life—for "Man," as Victor Hugo said, "occupies the lowest degree in the intellectual scale, a scale invisible and infinite, by which each spirit mounts to eternity and of which GOD is the summit"—in which the sinner, for all the sense of his guilt, realises the spiritual headship of CHRIST and his own eternal Sonship in the FATHER. And, on the other hand, evolution, when regarded as the gradual unfolding of the potentialities of human life, is a process that finds its explanation in the Person of its Head, for in the Word made flesh our "flesh" potentially died to sin and rose again to righteousness. In CHRIST'S Death the race died, and in CHRIST'S Resurrection lies the potency of its new

[1] Sir Oliver Lodge, "Man and the Universe," p. 310.

and risen life. For the human can only develop when united with and dwelling in the Divine. Internal relations are the explanation of external, not *vice versa*. That this is not vapid theorising is proved by the indisputable fact that CHRIST Himself is the one grand principle of unity in His Church, that when men are united by love for Him, all differences of class and creed become minor matters of detail. He is stronger to unite than they are to separate. The recent World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh[1] proves that CHRIST, and CHRIST alone, is indispensable and vital to the Body of believers, and that in Him—"in Whom we see balanced and united the separate gifts and graces of which we catch glimpses only in His followers"[2]—men of every Christian creed are sensible of a supreme spiritual power, a central, unifying influence, just as others are sensible of an ideal life. The solidaric unity of the race without CHRIST may be, as Lotze remarks, "an impossible conception," but in CHRIST the universal brotherhood of man is an idea that is being daily more and more realised. Is not this a practical proof of His spiritual and organic Headship of the race, and that He is our Representative before GOD? That His acts and sufferings are racial, and that His union with mankind is spiritual and mystical, are but corollaries of the proposition of that universal Headship which involves identification.

The secret of the Atonement was, therefore, the self-identification of the immanent, indwelling CHRIST with the race. Of this identification—this moral and mystical union with man—the Incarnation in which the Word became flesh was an historic phase. GOD in CHRIST identified Himself, however, not with the spirit of rebelliousness, but with the sadness and sorrows of the race in which that spirit was rampant. And in consequence of

[1] June, 1910. [2] Jowett.

His self-identification with us He involved Himself in all the consequences of the human lot, possessing Himself of our nature in order to restore; as GOD in Man feeling the judgment of GOD on sin and conscious of the Divine reaction against sin; and as Man in GOD acknowledging the justice of that judgment and confessing the sin of humanity, and conquering it in Himself and those who through the SPIRIT are one with Him and in Him.

He realised in the same personal consciousness the consecrating character of the righteousness of GOD, and the separating force of the iniquity of man. There is, however, an absolute personal relation to sin on His part, as there is an absolute personal relation to righteousness on our part, implied in 2 Cor. v. 21—"Him Who knew no sin He made to be sin on our behalf, that we may become the righteousness of GOD in Him." It was because He knew no sin that He was made sin. Because He was GOD as well as Man He could identify Himself completely with the conciousness of what sin and its cruelty, its impurity, its horror, its hate, its scorn and its damnation, really are in GOD's sight—a thing impossible to one who had sinned and had, accordingly, a partnership or ownership in sin. It was because He was holy and knew what holiness was that He could hate sin, as a hostile intrusion, in which He had no part nor lot, into that humanity created by the FATHER—a thing that prevented the deification of the race with which He had made Himself one in nature and in love—with a holy, withering hate which could never burn with like intensity in one who had surrendered himself but once to its power. This is what the Apostle wished to express. He could never have meant that the Holy One of GOD was made unholy, impure, or unrighteous for us. If so, how could we hope to become the righteousness of GOD in Him? Nay, He beheld the vision of sin with the pure insight of GOD; and as Incarnate Man He felt its terrible effects and power in the body He had taken upon Himself,

and its appalling issues, developments, and consequences in the humanity He summed up in Himself. He Who knew no actual sin in His own experience, knew it in His human consciousness in such a way that He felt its humiliation and degradation as only a sinless consciousness could, and condemned it in the flesh—as only a holy, Divine Being could—with the consciousness of GOD. The object of that self-identification was not to transfer His righteousness to us, but to enable us by His quickening Spirit to look upon sin with the same eyes, to feel the same horror and hatred of it, to win us to the side of righteousness, that we might identify ourselves with His condemnation of sin in the flesh, walking not after the flesh, but after the Spirit, and thus should become righteous in Him, the Head and Consummator of our humanity, and reflect in some measure the Divine righteousness which was manifested in Him.

Lotze's statement is a reaction against the extreme view of Luther that our LORD was actually made sin. In his comment on the text in question Luther wrote: "All the prophets saw this in the Spirit, that CHRIST would be the greatest robber, murderer, adulterer, thief, sacrilegious person, blasphemer;"[1] and again he said: "When a sinner cometh to the knowledge of himself he feeleth not only that he is a sinner, and accursed, but even sin and malediction itself. For it is a terrible thing to bear sin, the wrath of GOD, malediction and death. Wherefore, that man which hath a true feeling of these things, as CHRIST did truly and effectually feel them for all mankind, is made even sin, death, and malediction."[2] Luther's conclusion was that the sin of mankind having been literary transferred to CHRIST, we are completely absolved from all sins, "yet not through ourselves, our own works or merits, but through Him."

[1] Quoted by Scott Lidgett, p. 464.
[2] "Epistle to Galatians," p. 300.

The issue is obscured by rendering "sin" as "sin-offering," as Augustine [1] interpreted it. For so the antitheses were destroyed. It is the contrast of sin with righteousness that gives point to the Apostle's argument. "He knows no sin," wrote Maurice, "*therefore* He identifies Himself with the sinner. That phrase, *identifies Himself with the sinner*, is somewhat nearer, I think, to the sense of the Apostle than the phrase, *takes the consequences or the punishment of sin*. But still, do you not feel how much feebler it is than his, feebler in spirit more even than in form? It conveys no impression of the sense, the taste, the anguish of sin, which St. Paul would have us to think of, as realised by the SON of GOD—a sense, a taste, an anguish, which are not only compatible with the *not* knowing sin, but would be impossible to anyone who did know it." [2] Maurice protests again the taking of the words "*made sin*" in a coarse and material sense as the discharge of a debt for another, seeing that they are concerned with the spirit of man, and, therefore, are to be tried only by its tests. So tried, he says, they set forth "One Who knows all man's evil, One Who enters into it, feels it, because He is *not* soiled and debased with it; One Who does this, because in no other way can He raise a voluntary and spiritual creature out of a voluntary and spiritual death to a right and true life."

This is a sounder Scriptural exegesis than Luther's, for it was just because CHRIST knew not sin that He conquered it in Himself, and conquers it in those who are in Him. His identification with our sin is the consequence of His identification with humanity. He identified Himself with sin in the sense that He felt the contamination, the power, and the repulsiveness of the thing His soul,

[1] "Dictus est et ipse peccatum, sacrificandus ad diluenda peccata. In vetere quidem lege peccata vocabantur sacrificia pro peccatis" ("Enchiridion," chap. xiii.).

[2] "The Doctrine of Sacrifice," pp. 188 *et seq.*

because of its intense purity and holiness, loathed, in order to save men from its influence and to reconcile them to GOD's law and love. He identified Himself with man at his worst, in order to bring out the best in man. At His Cross humanity at its worst—in the moment of its seeming triumph—was overcome by humanity at its best—in the moment of apparent failure—because the latter could not be made sinful, and the former could be made righteous. The Reconciler of GOD and man identified Himself so completely with humanity that the separating element in humanity ceased to exist, being superseded by a sanctifying, uniting influence. His death—in humanity—to sin and His resurrection—in humanity—to life are more than examples or inspirations to humanity; they are permanent spiritual endowments of the race. Therefore the resurrection which we share with Him is the uppermost thought in the Apostle's mind;[1] and therefore we see in Pentecost the consummation of Calvary.

It was Luther's intense feeling of his sin that led him to CHRIST, and then to identify CHRIST with his sin. But he did not end here. For he saw that such an identification must lead to an absorption and consequent annihilation of the evil by the good, and of death by life. "Therefore it is necessary in this war that sin should be conquered and slain, and that righteousness should conquer and live. So in CHRIST universal sin is conquered, is slain, and is buried, and righteousness remains eternally victorious and regnant."[2]

"Him Who knew no sin He made to be sin for us," is, accordingly, a paradoxical expression in which the metaphor is strained to its utmost capacity. There are similar paradoxes in philosophical statements of the great problems of moral life, such as the relation of virtue and

[1] Eph. ii. 6: "And hath raised us up with Him."
[2] Scott Lidgett, p. 466.

happiness, of self-love and virtue, of right and expediency, of freedom and necessity. "Philanthropy," wrote Professor Grote, "is the best self-love,"[1] meaning something similar to Butler, who said: "In one respect benevolence contributes more to private interest—*i.e.*, enjoyment or satisfaction—than any of the other particular common affections, as it is in a degree its own gratification";[2] but something totally different from Kant, who wrote: "Self-love, when taken as the principle of all our actions, is in fact the source of all evil."[3] Perfect happiness attends on perfect virtue; yet he who seeks the former will lose the latter. As our LORD said: "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it, and whosoever will lose his life for My sake shall find it."[4] For selfishness is *propter vitam vivendi perdere causas;* and usefulness is attained by a purely ethical disregard of utility.[5] Again, Dr. Illingworth writes: "To obey law is to surrender our free will by an act of free will. Hence, paradoxical as it may sound, free will (our initial, formal, potential free will) exists in order to be surrendered, and only by its surrender do we become practically free."[6] Philosophy has her own explanations for these paradoxical statements. Attention has been drawn to them here, merely to show that this moral paradox of our LORD's life—"Him Who knew no sin He made to be sin"—is not unparalleled, and that as philosophy can argue that benevolence is coincident, though not identical, with self-love (in the higher sense); that freedom, though not identical, is coincident with necessity (in the higher sense); that virtue, though not identical, is coincident with happiness; and that right, though not

[1] "Exam. of Utilitarian Philosophy," p. 104.
[2] Butler, chap. xi.
[3] "Theory of Ethics," Abbott's Trans., p. 353.
[4] Matt. xvi. 25.
[5] Jackson, "Retribution," p. 230.
[6] "Divine Immanence," p. 230.

identical, is coincident with expediency (in the higher sense), so our LORD'S righteousness was not identical with sin, but was coincident with His feeling the sinfulness of sin. All these propositions are synthetical, not analytical.[1] The LORD did not identify Himself with sin, but with the humanity in which sin was regnant; and His identification of Himself with humanity caused Him to take upon Himself the burden of sin which separated humanity from the FATHER and Him, and to overcome it, so that the man in CHRIST may truly say, "Who then shall separate us from the love of CHRIST? . . . neither death nor life . . . nor any other thing shall be able to separate us from the love of GOD, which is in CHRIST JESUS our LORD."[2] His innocence of sin was compatible with His bearing of sin. But the Sin-bearer is not to be identified with that which He sought to annihilate. This were to repeat the blasphemy of His enemies. The principle of sin was absorbed by the victorious principle of His righteousness, just as our enmity with GOD was absorbed in His reconciliation. With the paradoxical expression, "Him Who knew no sin He made to be sin," we may compare such paradoxes as occur in 2 Cor. vi. 10—"As having nothing and yet possessing all things"; and 2 Cor. xii. 9, 10—"My strength is made perfect in weakness . . . when I am weak, then am I strong," the figure being a favourite one with the Apostle. As the strength of CHRIST is made perfect, or reaches its perfection, in weakness, in the bearing of weakness, so His righteousness was manifested in the bearing of the contradiction of sin.

Applying this principle to the race as the Body of CHRIST the Head, we see the CHRIST in us bearing our sin, sustaining the brunt of its attack in us, removing its

[1] See Kant, Abbott's Trans., p. 209.
[2] Rom. viii. 35-39.

sting in us, conquering and overcoming it in us, and in a measure feeling its terrible responsibility in us. The CHRIST in us strengthens our weakness; removes our sin. The transcendent CHRIST, immanent also in our humanity, is united to us by the closest of ties, real and sentimental, moral and mystical, spiritual and Divine. In Him we subsist, in us He suffers. In us He endures a perpetual passion, that we in Him may participate in an eternal triumph. In us He makes atonement, that we in Him may be atoned. In us He is bearing the sin of the world, that we in Him may be helped to bear the discipline of our sin, and to find in it a satisfaction of the soul. In us He is conquering sin, that we also may conquer it in ourselves. He identified Himself so completely with humanity that He said, speaking of the desolate and unhappy, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me."[1]

And through His self-identification with us we learn to identify ourselves with Him. This latter identification is, indeed, the object of the former, and it has been well expressed by St. Paul in the words, "I have been crucified with CHRIST, but I live; yet not I, but it is CHRIST that liveth in me; and the life that I now live in the flesh, in faith I live it, even in the faith of the SON of GOD, Who loved me and gave Himself for me."[2] CHRIST identified Himself with our nature in its integrity, its wholeness, its complexity, in its state of tribulation, in all its disabilities, of which death is the climax, that He might lead man to identify himself with the cause of truth and love and GOD, which He represented and vindicated in His own Life and Person, by personal love and gratitude to Himself. We are, therefore, called to suffer with Him, to fill up that which is lacking in the affliction of CHRIST,[3] that we may be labourers together with Him; that we may share in

[1] Matt. xxv. 40. [2] Gal. ii. 20. [3] Col. i. 24.

His suffering, His redemptive work, and His glory. GOD works through human instrumentality. "Socii Dei sumus," wrote Seneca. By man in CHRIST the victory of the CHRIST-Man is to be finally won.

The Cross was for CHRIST the test of discipleship,[1] and is for us the emblem of our religion, in which we are crucified to the world and the world to us. Such identification with CHRIST on man's part is the only way to the appropriation of the blessing of the full favour of GOD—the grace of the reconciled life. The unique place attached to the Cross in the Epistles was due to the fact that it represented such an identification on His part with us, and on our part with Him. He was crucified through weakness, that is, through His physical identity with our humanity, yet He liveth by the power of GOD.[2] "And they that are CHRIST'S"—who have identified themselves with Him—"have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts"[3]; with Him our old man is crucified[4]; by Him the world is crucified to Paul, and Paul to the world.[5]

The Cross is, therefore, a symbol of our mystical union with Him, both in the suffering and triumph, both in the sorrow and the joy. As it was the climax of His humiliation,[6] it is the symbol of the sinner's penitent and crucified self; as it was the scene of His triumph, it is the source of the sinner's glory.[7]

[1] Matt. x. 38: "He that taketh not his cross and followeth after Me is not worthy of Me"; Mark viii. 34: "Whosoever will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow Me." *Cf.* Luke xiv. 27; Matt. xvi. 24.

[2] 2 Cor. xiii. 4. [3] Gal. v. 24. [4] *Cf.* Rom. vi. 6.

[5] John xii. 52: "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Myself."

[6] "Obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross" (Phil. ii. 8)—a humiliation which was a stumbling-block to the Jews, who expected a ruling Messiah, and foolishness to the Greeks, who despised self-sacrifice and humiliation, yet necessary as the crowning experience of the life of the Son of Man and the supreme test of His character.

[7] Gal. vi. 14.

Such identification of CHRIST with us is not substitution. It cannot be expressed in the formula, "Ego suum peccatum tuum, tu es justitia mea." Neither guilt nor penitence is morally transferable. The penalties of sin are not penalties, but pains, to an innocent man. CHRIST'S penitence for our sins is not our repentance, but its possibility. He was the Representative of humanity, Who suffered in His own life *for* the life and in the life He represented voluntarily. Yet He could not identify Himself with the sin that separates man from GOD; that thwarts the Divine purpose; that pollutes the human conscience and enslaves the human will; but with the humanity that was separated, polluted, and enslaved, and so incapable of realising the idea of GOD. His Personal identity was not lost in His identity with man—for such would be a psychological fiction—nor would it be possible for a Holy Being to identify Himself with evil. Hatred of sin strove in His soul with love of sinners. "CHRIST hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us,"[1] means that He submitted to all the conditions of our human lot—which, like the ground that beareth thorns and briars, "is near a curse,"[2] for it is full of evil, pain, and tribulation—on our behalf, and converted them into a blessing by the spirit in which He bore them, just as the land which, untilled, is "near a curse," when tilled receives a blessing from GOD.[3]

The great Head of our race is thus a "quickening Spirit" in us. He becomes the Redeemer of our several persons, because He is the Representative of our common humanity, and the Fount whence our new life proceeds. By reason of our organic union with Him, His acts are, in a sense, our acts; His Death our death; His Resurrection our resurrection. For His Death and Resurrection were in potency the death and resurrection of the race with

[1] Gal. iii. 13. [2] Heb. vi. 8. [3] Heb. vi. 7.

which He identified Himself, but are ours who believe in Him in *esse*. This means that in Him we have died to sin, in Him we have been raised in righteousness—if we actually identify ourselves with Him as St. Paul did in Gal. ii. 20: "I am crucified with CHRIST, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but CHRIST liveth in me"; and in Col. i. 27, "CHRIST in me the hope of glory."

In accordance with that identification of Himself with man, GOD the FATHER, Who was in the SON as He suffered, sees the SON still in humanity, as it suffers and works out its own salvation with the help of the new power received through its self-identification with CHRIST. As our Representative—for He is still the Son of Man—He is encountering an intruder into His own realm—even the humanity with which He identified Himself, and for which He gave Himself that it might be doubly His. As GOD'S Representative He is acceptable in the sight of GOD, as having revealed the character of the FATHER in the words and deeds of the SON. On the one hand, He is the revelation of the truth of the Divine holiness; on the other, the exhibition of the truth of the human heart.

The self-identification of the Son of Man with mankind was the secret of that perfect sympathy with us which was the reason of His sufferings, and of the efficacy of His death. It caused His sufferings and His death to take on a representative character, to become a "racial act." As our Representative He felt the anguish and isolation, the hopelessness and humiliation of sin. All its waves passed over Him. And because of His relationship to the FATHER, with Whose holiness He identified Himself so completely, His Divine insight into the causes and results of sin made Him feel with a keener intensity the consequences of His identification of Himself with us. He was a Divine Person, not merely expressing Himself in terms of humanity, but suffering under human conditions with such loyalty and

devotion that the Deity was revealed in the extremity of His Passion. "Truly this was the SON of GOD." The humanity He assumed became the living utterance of His Divinity. The dualism implied in the expression "GOD *and* Man," with an undue emphasis on the "and,"[1] veils the fact that He was GOD acting and suffering in and through and as man—the same eternal, indivisible, Divine Personality all through, conditioned by His humanity, but making that humanity the expression of His Deity. His sufferings have, therefore, a tremendous significance, not only because they are the sufferings of the Creator *for* His erring creation, but also because they are the sufferings of the Creator *in* His travailing creation.[2] His cry of dereliction on the Cross, "My GOD, My GOD, why hast Thou forsaken Me?"—one of Schmiedel's nine "absolutely credible passages"—meant something deeper and more mysterious than the appropriation of the cry of the writer of the twenty-second Psalm. It could not mean that He was vicariously bearing the Divine wrath against sin, which He never endured;[3] neither could it mean that it was a mere subjective feeling caused by a weakening of faith through bodily anguish.[4] Neither was it wrung from Him through sense of failure or by the ingratitude of man.[5] But it signified the completeness of His identification

[1] See Moberly, "Atonement and Personality," p. 96.

[2] Sir Oliver Lodge speaks of a "sympathetic shudder" that passed "through the whole of existence, which might well be parabolically expressed in terms of current altruistic sacrificial legend" ("Man and the Universe," p. 232).

[3] Even Calvin ("Inst.," ii. 16, 11) does not suggest that GOD was ever His adversary or angry with Him. He was the beloved SON all through His life and in His death—the consummation of His life—He was obedient, well-pleasing, and well-beloved.

[4] So Meyer, who held that it was a "subjective feeling," and that "there was no objective desertion on the part of GOD." But this explanation seems insufficient. There is no doubt that the faintness of the flesh added to, and perhaps caused, the weakening consciousness of the FATHER'S presence.

[5] Renan.

with sinners, which caused Him to forget Himself in those He represented so that He actually lost, for a moment, the consciousness of His FATHER's presence in His passing through death, even as the cry "It is finished" signified the completion of His self-sacrifice, the consummation of His life-work, and the perfect peace in which the miseries, sorrows, contradictions and tragedies of human life are adjusted and atoned. As the saint dies with a prayer to GOD on his lips, so the SAVIOUR passed into His FATHER'S presence. This were a proof, if any were needed, of His immortal and Divine love, for love ever identifies itself with its object. But this was not all. Our LORD was passing out of bodily contact and visible communion with those He loved into the isolation and loneliness of GOD. Here was a very human touch. He shared all the limitations of our mortal nature even in "the crossing of the bar." There was an intense horror of sin and an immense love of sinners in the same soul. The love conquered the horror, and the SAVIOUR died. His death was the climax of His perfect conformity with our nature; the proof of His complete identity with our interests; the crowning experience of the life, the supreme test of the character of the Son of Man. It was the true Shepherd dying for the lost sheep, to show His love and to save their life.

His sufferings, on the one hand, were a revelation of His Deity. The passionless Deity of deductive logic would never have manifested the humility and self-sacrifice which St. Paul saw was a cardinal attribute of GOD. A Satanic Spirit might be omniscient and omnipotent, but would never suffer, never sympathise. Induction, on the other hand, teaches us to go to CHRIST, not with a ready-made conception of what constitutes the perfection of the Divine nature, but with a real desire to study His revelation of that nature. And He has manifested in His life and death a GOD that appeals to all the heart of humanity

—a GOD that bears the sins and the sorrows of man, and would rather be known and loved as the self-sacrificing SAVIOUR than as the self-asserting Judge, so that men may become partakers of His Divine nature—in its humility and its love, in its will to suffer and to bear the burdens of man.

His sufferings, on the other hand, were intensified by His self-identification with us. GOD in CHRIST submitting to the conditions of human existence experienced the limitations thereof; felt the current of evil which had set in against His Divine obedience; and was oppressed by the "contradictions of sinners," and the conflict with the "ruler of this world." In submitting to all this, He suffered in His own Self by reason of the perfect sympathy between His human and Divine natures, based upon the complete identity of His Person. But His sufferings were not penal, but redemptive. In His own Person,[1] which could not be touched with punishment, He offered up our sins in His body on the tree, that we, becoming dead to sins, might live unto righteousness." [2]

Could identification be more complete; and yet where is the penal element? "He committed Himself,"[3] wrote the same Apostle in the preceding line, "to Him that judgeth righteously." In Rom. viii. 32, St. Paul wrote: "If GOD be on our behalf,[4] who can be against us? Who spared[5] not His own SON,[6] but gave[7] Him on behalf[8] of us all, how shall He not with Him freely give[9] us all things?"

The phrase "did not spare"[10] seems to have been an

[1] αὐτός. [2] 1 Pet. ii. 24. [3] παρεδίδου.
[4] ὑπέρ. [5] ἐφείσατο. [6] ἰδίου.
[7] παρέδωκεν. [8] ὑπέρ. [9] χαρίσεται.

[10] Here we note that the FATHER did *not spare* the SON; while in Acts xx. 29 St. Paul had spoken of grievous wolves *not sparing the flock*. In 2 Pet. ii. 4 we read: "For if GOD *did not spare* (οὐκ ἐφείσατο) the angels who had sinned, but consigned (παρέδωκεν) them into ward for judgment, and *did not spare* (οὐκ ἐφείσατο) the ancient world." And

ancient ecclesiastical phrase, and while in other passages it refers to some injury or punishment inflicted, in Rom. viii. 32 it is saved from such interpretation by its association with the word *χαρίσεται* (He shall freely give). GOD's free gift of His SON was not given to inflict suffering on the SON, but that the world through Him might be saved.[1] But the word certainly implies suffering, a suffering on the part of the FATHER, as the word "His own"[2] implies—for in not sparing His own SON He spared not Himself—as well as suffering on the part of the SON. A man may give his own life freely; but a true father will hesitate before he gives his son to death. The point for emphasis, however, is rather this, that St. Paul used a word of the FATHER in His relation to us which he had also used of the SON in His relation to us. The FATHER gave the SON on behalf of us all,[3] while the SON died on our behalf. And as the FATHER gave the SON to us, so the SON gave Himself to the FATHER. These expressions point to the perfect union of the FATHER and the SON in the Atonement. It is startling to read after this Pauline passage the words of Luther: "GOD's anger against the sinner was so fierce that He could not be appeased only by the blood of His SON." This could be interpreted, in opposition to the passage under consideration, to mean that GOD gave His Only Begotten SON to men that men might slay Him and give the FATHER the satisfaction of His Death. This would be even worse ethics than the *justice* which would insist on the suffering of the penalty regardless of who the person might be who suffered it. But we find both St. Paul and St. John supporting the

---

"If GOD *did not spare* (*οὐκ ἐφείσατο*) the natural branches," St. Paul writes in Rom. xi. 21. And he says of himself: "I shall not spare" (2 Cor. xiii. 2).

[1] John iii. 16-17.

[2] *ἰδίου.*

[3] *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων* (Rom. v. 8, etc.); *ὑπὲρ πάντων* (2 Cor. v. 14).

teaching of the Sermon on the Mount and the parable of the Prodigal Son, in which the FATHER is represented as being on our side, not thirsting for satisfaction or punishment, but yearning for the repentance of the sinner in order to confer His gracious pardon upon him, and to restore him to his FATHER'S Home—that is, to give him salvation and life. Dr. Dale's words with reference to the doctrine of the Atonement, "I find in the Epistles to the Romans and the Ephesians a fuller manifestation of the mind of CHRIST than in the Sermon on the Mount,"[1] is as startling as Luther's, in view of the complete agreement of this passage in the Romans with the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount. The Death of CHRIST was not penal, but redemptive. His Death was the death of humanity; it recovered for us the grace of repentance.

> "Pre-eminent in one thing most of all
> The Man of Sorrows; and the Cross of CHRIST
> Is more to us than all the miracles."

That Death was at once the proof of His perfect identification with the race He would save, and of the achievement of the work the FATHER gave Him to do, the climax of His sympathy, the crowning act of His obedience and the test of His character. Although for Him death meant much—separation from His beloved companions, from His beloved Mother, from the life that He led on earth, from the joy of the sunshine on lake and hill and field—He endured it, for He spared not Himself, but gave Himself freely to us. Every gift He gave seemed to cost Him something. The healing of the woman was a loss of power[2] to Himself. The salvation of the race meant the surrender of His life. The mental anguish He endured because of the terrible workings of evil in the race with which He identified Himself must have been unspeakably great, sufficient, indeed, to cause Him for a moment to

[1] "Biography," p. 665.

[2] *δύναμις* (Mark v. 30).

lose consciousness of the Divine Presence. And this anguish must have been intensified by the fact that this identification was not fictitious or imaginary, but had a real living basis in His organic connection with the race of man, so that though sinless in Himself He could in a sense regard the guilt of man, not, indeed, as His own, but at any rate as that of the human nature He had assumed to redeem from the influence of sin. And in that way He entered into the responsibility of it. This fact throws a corrective light upon the doctrine of imputation. Kant, in his introduction to the "Metaphysic of Morals,"[1] stated that "an action is called a deed in so far as it comes under laws of obligation, and consequently, in so far as the subject is regarded in it according to the freedom of his elective will, the agent is regarded as by such an act the *author* of the effect, and this, along with the action itself, may be *imputed* to him, if he is previously acquainted with the law by virtue of which an *obligation* rests upon him. A *person* is the subject whose actions are capable of *imputation*." This passage clearly shows that *imputation* follows personal responsibility, which corresponds with *obligation* in the Kantian sense. And this is the sense in which the word "impute"[2] is used in the LXX—*e.g.*, in Lev. xvii. 4—where it is stated that because of some ritual omission "blood shall be imputed[3] unto that man. *He hath shed blood.*" So when sin is imputed it is because sin has been done by a responsible person. But penitence prevents the imputation. "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man unto whom the LORD imputeth[4] not iniquity." "GOD was in CHRIST, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing[5] their

[1] Rev. T. K. Abbott's edition, p. 279.
[2] λογίζεσθαι.
[3] λογισθήσεται.
[4] λογίσηται (Ps. xxxii. 1, 2).
[5] λογιζόμενος (2 Cor. v. 19).

trespasses unto them." But sin is not imputed unto the ignorant, for in this case there is no conscious failure in obligation and responsibility. "Abraham believed GOD, and it was counted[1] to him for righteousness," accordingly means that GOD accepted his faith as a fulfilment of obligation or duty. In the case of the Son of Man, Who fulfilled all righteousness, there seems to have been an acceptance of responsibility for the sin of the race, for the failures and misdeeds of humanity. As the Creator of the race, He was indirectly answerable for them; as "the firstborn among many brethren,"[2] He accepted responsibility, wherever such obligation was recognised, for the broken law. In this sense our LORD made Himself responsible for the failure of humanity and for the extension of the moral law of the righteousness of GOD among men. And in a lesser degree every man who would follow in His steps must make himself more or less responsible for the conduct of his neighbours, inasmuch as his example and influence can do much to improve and reform them by raising their moral and spiritual environment. It is in this sense that we can interpret the words: "GOD made Him to be sin for us, Who knew no sin, that we might become the righteousness of GOD *in* Him."[3]

The FATHER did not regard the SON as bearing our guilt. For guilty is a type of character, a state of the soul. It would be a moral fiction to impute the sins of the guilty to the innocent and accept His punishment instead of ours. But our LORD in His human spirit as our Representative, as the federal Head of our race, even as He *recapitulated* our humanity in Himself, recapitulated[4] the consequences of

[1] ἐλογίσθη (Jas. ii. 23; Rom. iv. 3).
[2] Rom. viii. 29.
[3] 2 Cor. v. 21.
[4] Irenæus, "Adv. Haer.," iii. 21, 20: "Ita recapitulans in se Adam"; iii. 21, 1: "Recapitulationem Adae in se faciens"; iii. 22, 1: "Suum plasma in semetipsum recapitulans"; iii. 22, 3: "Et generationem hominum cum ipso Adam in semetipso recapitulatus est."

such identification, the sorrow, the grief, and bitter shame at the sight of, and at the contact with, man's degraded life, knowing how good they might have been and how good they could still be if they would participate in the Divine love and life He offered them freely, and so realise the Divine idea of human life—the image and likeness of GOD. He felt the pangs of death in order to conquer them. They were the pangs that preceded the new life for Himself and His people. As Irenæus said, "Recapitulating all mankind in Himself from the beginning to the end, He also recapitulated their death,"[1] and "so death is emptied of its sting (*evacuata*) by CHRIST,"[2] and "the disobedience that arose in connection with one tree was healed by the obedience that was displayed upon another."[3]

Dr. Denney protests against what he calls the false abstraction which would put sin into one world—the moral—and death into another—the physical. He writes: "Sin and death do not belong to unrelated worlds. As far as man is concerned, the two worlds, to use an inadequate figure, intersect; and at one point in the line of their intersection sin and death meet and interpenetrate. In the indivisible experience of man he is conscious that they are parts or aspects of the same thing."[4] "Sin and death hang together."[5] "Sin and death have essential relations to each other."[6] "The connection of sin and death in Scripture . . . is a profound conviction and experience of the human conscience."[7] On the other hand, there are others who cannot regard physical death as the penalty of sin. There is nothing in Scripture to show that man would have lived for ever had he not sinned. Science regards death as

[1] Irenæus, "Adv. Haer.," v. 23, 1.
[2] *Ibid.*, iii. 23, 7.
[3] *Ibid.*, v. 16, 3.
[4] *Expositor*, No. xlv., p. 175.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 176.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 178.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 179.

natural, and as necessary as life to the existence and evolution of living forms. Our LORD did not teach men to fear physical death, but that which implied separation from GOD. *Death* as the antithesis of *life* meant for St. Paul a state of separation from GOD. Death as "the wages of sin" is not the dissolution of the body. But yet He Who was not holden of physical death is the Living Power that not only frees man from its terror and darkness, but makes man partaker of the Life which is eternal because spiritual. And He entered into the dread experience, although He could not endure the damnation of sin. He suffered a removal from this environment; a dissolution of the mortal instrument, a breaking up of His vital faculties; although death for Him meant reunion with the beloved FATHER. But His death meant not the death of righteousness, but the death of sin—another paradox; for the slaying of the sinless was the suicide of sin. The shadows of death fell across His soul that they might be removed from us, who look forward to a reunion with Him and our beloved dead in Him. He experienced the forsaken condition of sin and death that we might not experience it. He felt what it was to lose the consciousness of the FATHER'S presence, for the moment, that we might not live in the eclipse of our spirit's light for eternity.

The sorrows of the Man of Sorrows, unspeakably great in themselves, were intensified because of His nature, so sinless, so loving, so devoted to His FATHER, and so identified with man. His honour was touched in the dishonour of His children into whom He had poured His life, without counting the cost to Himself, for sin had crept into the very soul of that which was dearer to Him than His life—even His offspring, organically and spiritually His. And by reason of our organic and spiritual union with Him, His obedience and righteousness are ours. The result of His identification with us is that GOD saw the

race in the Representative, and the Representative in the race. He identified Himself with our condition that we might be identified with Him. So that in the fulness of time He may sum up all things that are in Heaven and in earth in Himself.[1]

This, our identification with Him, which is the secret of the Christian life, is the prospective aspect of the Atonement, the final cause of His identification with us. CHRIST would have us one with Him in spirit and in truth, a real identification as the result of a real incarnation, which, indeed, is atonement. For just so far as men share the Spirit of CHRIST, Who is at one with GOD, are they at one with GOD. By the subjective qualities of faith and love we are united with CHRIST, and we appropriate and make our own that Divine Life of GOD which was not only manifested, but which also energised in humanity. As every form of life has its own peculiar kind of energy, a living faith has its own special manifestation which is the proof of its vitality. Faith in CHRIST is a living connection, a life that follows a death to self and sin, and is lived to GOD in righteousness. As St. Paul says, "And the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the SON of GOD."[2] The theology is living that is expressed in such terms of life. For such faith is living union and fellowship with CHRIST, a spiritual Sonship in the FATHER. By our identification with CHRIST we share His life, His energy, His virtue, His Sonship.[3]

This does not affect our personal identity. Faith and love give identity of cause, being, power, and nature to all believers, with the Divine Source and Object of their belief, so that we are members of CHRIST and members one of another. As persons we are ourselves; as His

[1] Eph. i. 10. [2] Gal. ii. 20.

[3] "Because ye are sons, GOD sent forth the Spirit of His SON into your hearts, crying, Abba, FATHER" (Gal. iv. 6).

sheep we are His, members of His Body, sharers in His Divine Life. His cause is ours and His holiness is ours by faith, which is the faculty of identifying ourselves with Him in spirit. And He, on His part, co-operates with us by making our self-identification with Him possible through His Divine SPIRIT, Who dwelleth in us. This is the meaning of the "earnest"[1] of the SPIRIT, the inner peace and satisfaction that such an identification of the disciple and his Master produces in the human heart—a foretaste of the abundant life and joy that shall be ours when that identification is consummated in the eternal kingdom. It is the SPIRIT Who perpetuates the presence of CHRIST. It is He Who continues and consummates the grace and power of the Life and Death of JESUS CHRIST in the Church and in the believer until the LORD comes; nay, more, Who makes us partakers in the Life and Death that atoned. It is the Spirit of JESUS Who imparts the grace of the Atonement to us; Who by His Divine Presence in our hearts makes the effects of that Atonement ours, and leads us to that identification of ourselves with CHRIST which constitutes our righteousness in the sight of GOD. As the Spirit of the Incarnate He extends the spiritual power of that Incarnation to us by effecting our personal communion and union with CHRIST, so that we are one with CHRIST, and CHRIST is one with us. In this union we are led forward to the development of our truest self, the consummation of our highest selfhood, in which development and consummation we realise not another, but our own self—a self redeemed and regenerated, transformed and transfigured by the indwelling Spirit of CHRIST; not a self absorbed in the SPIRIT, but a self which has become wholly free, truly living, truly active, truly conscious, by incorporation with Him. Thus we become partakers of the Divine nature as the *Deus*

[1] 2 Cor. i. 22; v. 5, Rom. viii. 23.

Immanens in humanity leads to the deification of man.[1] As Clement of Alexandria writes: "Wherefore we are bound in every respect by the closest ties with CHRIST, in kinship on account of the blood by which we are redeemed; in sympathy by reason of the nourishment we receive from the Word, and in incorruption because of His way of life."[2] And as Athanasius says: "The Word was made flesh in order to offer up this body for all, and that we, partaking of His Spirit, might be gods.[3] For it is the Spirit of the Risen CHRIST that initiates and consummates the union of GOD and man in CHRIST.

In this way the Atonement becomes a reality in human life. But this is not all. The identification of CHRIST with the race intensifies the solidarity of humanity already presupposed in the Atonement. However remote from each other in prejudice, nationality, and religion, men are nearer each other in heart by virtue of Him Who shared our common humanity. Everything that touches man touches the SAVIOUR'S heart, and everything that touches the Head of the race must touch the members of the race. The slightest disturbance in the Christian Body communicates itself to all members of the system, and is bound to reach the CHRIST if the balance is to be recovered. The solidarity of the race is thus the natural result of the incarnate and atoning grace of GOD, by means of which the organism of humanity is made complete in CHRIST. Owing to this solidarity, GOD sees in humanity the CHRIST taking and bearing the burden of sin and perfecting the still imperfect life.

[1] Athanasius, "Orat.," i. 39: "He was GOD, and became Man to make us gods."

[2] "Paed.," i. 127.

[3] "Decr.," p. 14

CHAPTER V

RETRIBUTION

So far we have assumed the possibility of the forgiveness of sins in and through CHRIST. But the forgiveness of sins is one of the problems of our age. It is held that the assurance of the forgiveness of sins which was once the power of the Gospel is so no longer, because, on the one hand, the ordinary man is not interested in the matter, and, on the other, the philosopher does not regard it as either possible or advantageous. It is alleged that the old traditional view of sin and its forgiveness does not meet the moral requirements of the age. Man is apt to resent a forgiveness of sins when he desiderates their annihilation. The modern dramatist treats it as an impossibility, the reformer as an irrelevancy. The placid theist assumes forgiveness of sins as a matter of course—that it is the business of GOD, as Heine flippantly remarked, to forgive. And from the naturalistic standpoint forgiveness is a reversal of the natural law of cause and effect, and therefore an impossibility; the past seems irrevocable:

> "The moving finger writes; and, having writ,
> Moves on; not all your piety nor wit
> Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
> Nor all your tears wash out a word of it."[1]

It is, however, possible that both the naturalistic and the sentimental views of forgiveness are based on vicious

[1] Omar Khayyám, "Rubáiyát," lxxi.

reasoning. Sin is not a purely physical effect; it is the outward expression of the human will, which has the power to intervene in many ways in the succession of physical causes, and to combine these for its own purposes; and therefore sin cannot be confined to the sphere of physical causation. It is a matter of personality, character, and freedom. Neither is a matter to be treated with easy indifference when regarded as affecting the relation of the Divine personality and the human, which are ethical and universal, and therefore subject to the law of the Divine all-controlling life, which is loving to the sinner, but hostile to the sin.

Unconditional forgiveness is irrational in a rationally constituted universe. A philosophical view of retribution throws light on forgiveness. In an ethical world pardon does not tend to immunity or impunity. True penitence, which is the severest punishment of sin, is a certain aspect of reparation. The pardon that comforts and uplifts is that which is experienced after shame, remorse, contrition, anxiety to atone, desire to make amends for what has been done or left undone. Sin being the centre of the controversy of life, and the cause of its tragedy, for men subject to sin, and bitterly conscious of the fact, pardon and peace are blessed realities. For the others they have no meaning as yet. But sin awakens. And the awakening is stern. For sin is more than an error of judgment, a result of defective education, or an inherited weakness. Its very wilfulness shows that it is something that is the man's very own, the expression of his personality in its connection with other personalities. And nothing external to personality can reform or raise it. Herein lies the weakness of the naturalistic views of forgiveness and the transactional theories of Atonement. CHRIST'S work for us is incomplete without CHRIST'S work in us. Until the CHRIST in us has taught us to

bear the punishment of the sin, to acknowledge its guilt, to "dree its weird," to break its power, we cannot become the righteousness of GOD, or offer up a living sacrifice holy and acceptable to Him.

In the region of physical life, which is not a separate compartment from moral life, but which rises gradually upwards to it, law reigns supremely and serenely. "Every transgression receiveth a just recompense of reward." No negligence or disobedience here can evade the inevitable consequences. The uncertainty that must prevail with regard to the laws of man, which weakens their authority, is not found in the laws of Nature, which are the laws of Nature's GOD. The laws of physiology and biology do not deal gently with transgressors. In the spiritual sphere, too, the laws of GOD avenge themselves and exact the forfeiture to the veriest jot and tittle. But new forces o spiritual grace and redeeming mercy come into play here and bring about a change of life which no purely physical cause can explain. And yet they do not neutralise or supersede the workings of the Divine ordinances—of which retribution is one—but they turn them into a new direction and render them the instrument of a new purpose, so that what would have been the exaction of the penalty becomes the expiation of the offence.

"The mills of GOD grind slowly, but they grind exceeding small:
So soft and slow the great wheels go, they scarcely move at all;
But the souls of men fall into them, and are powdered into dust,
And from the dust grow three white flowers—faith, hope, trust."

Man must suffer for his deeds. "The history of the world is the judgment of the world."[1] Sin is made to be its own punishment. Man is permitted to sink deeper and deeper into the entanglements of the consequences of his own deeds until they strangle the nobler self within him, and "what might have been" ceases to trouble him. The

[1] Schiller.

Divine disappears. The diabolic reigns in its stead. The possibility of reformation—though we dare not say that it is ever ultimately extinguished—recedes further and further into the remoteness of the borderland of what is not and what cannot be, and the Nemesis, slow but sure, which dogs the heels of the wrongdoer, is hailed with gratitude by the spectators because it arrests the swift development of evil. The process that brings moral suffering to the sinner may be the result of a self-acting law, but it is also the sign that the love of GOD has not utterly abandoned the sinner, and will not allow his better self to be completely annihilated, for the very capacity for moral suffering is a guarantee of higher possibilities.

Of the world's deeper literature—of which the Greek drama is the noblest utterance—sin, retribution, and reconciliation form the central theme. The "Iliad" is a story of a man's blind folly and its baneful consequences and the necessary appeasement of the wrath of GOD and man. Aeschylus and Sophocles fulfilled the rôle of prophet as well as poet in their generation. As spokesmen for the gods they read the meaning of historical catastrophes, tracing them to some far-off sin unatoned for and the fruitful source of more sin and misery in the family. The unforgetful fury or fate that pursues the sinner is sure-footed, though sometimes slow.[1] The doer must suffer, or wrongdoing ends in sorrow,[2] was the maxim of Aeschylus, who viewed the subject from the standpoint of the gods, whose law is inexorable if their mercy is profound. Insolence[3] must be punished, that men may learn by suffering a reverent frame of mind.[4] Very terrible is the

[1] *μνήμονες* ("Choeph.," 524); *ὑστερόποινος* ("Agam.," 58; "Choeph.," 375); *καμψίπους* ("Theb.," 788). *Cf. δεινόπους* ("Elect.," 489); *χαλκόπους* ("Oed. Tyr.," 418).

[2] *δράσαντι παθεῖν* ("Choeph.," 303).

[3] *ὕβρις* ("Agam.," 735 *et seq.*

[4] *σωφρονεῖν* ("Agam.," 174).

description of the avenging furies and the propagation of sin and its curse from generation to generation in the Oresteia.[1] The smallest sin must be atoned for by suffering. "Blood for blood and blow for blow." The weird must be dree'd.[2]

> "Of justice the anvil is firmly set,
> And fate doth form and forge her sword thereon,
> And darkly brooding vengeance in due time
> Doth expiate the guilt of ancient blood."[3]

GOD is not mocked, "but mocks the reckless man, who boasted in his false security, now helpless in the grip of storms, nor able now the head to round, but dies, his former bliss all shattered on the bar of justice, unwept and unknown."[4]

These tragedies, read in the light of the second commandment and the words of St. Paul, "Be not deceived, GOD is not mocked, for whatsoever a man soweth that shall he reap," accentuate the justice and omnipotence of the Supreme Power Who dispenses justice and brings all things to their proper issues.[5]

But all suffering is not punishment and does not imply guilt. Like the Psalmist,[6] the poet, perplexed by the mysteries of sorrow and doom, takes refuge in GOD. And he writes: "If one would fain be free of anxious thought, there is no other, in my present guess, but *Zeus* to help. . . . One were well advised to yield to *Zeus*, who opes the road to wisdom and ordains that men shall learn from sorrows. For even in sleep the bane that will not be forgot doth haunt the mind, and wisdom comes to men

[1] "Choeph.," 303.

[2] τελεῖται δ' ἐς τὸ πεπρωμένον ("Agam.," 67). On the far-reaching consequences of sin, see "Agam.," 735 *et seq.*, and "Choeph.," 50-60.

[3] "Choeph.," 634 *et seq.*

[4] "Eum.," 530 *et seq.*; lit. **reef**: ἕρματι.

[5] Ζεὺς νεμέτωρ ("Theb.," 489); τέλειος ("Eum.," 28).

[6] Ps. lxxvii. 2: "In the days of my trouble I sought the LORD"; Ps. lxxiii. 17.

against their will, unwelcome mercy from the regnant Powers above."[1] Again he writes: "Knowledge comes by sad experience."[2] "It were expedient to learn wisdom[3] through suffering." In this light suffering is a salutary discipline that confers *σωφροσύνη*. And a fragment runs: "Still to the sufferer comes as due from GOD a glory that to suffering owes its birth." But the end is not all sorrow. Though destiny be inevitable, there is a note of hope which is expressed in the first choral ode of the "Agamemnon:" "The dirge be sung, but may the good prevail."[4] Compare the prayer, "Let right have might most sure for all to see." And at last there is a pardon for the penitent "schooled in adversity."[5] The blood fades away from the murderer's hand, and the weary suppliant who has submitted to the claims of justice, has dreed his weird and exhausted the hereditary curse, asserts "No stain lies on my soul, nor is my hand unclean." He has atoned for his crime by his suffering and submission. And the transformation of the implacable furies (Erinyes) into the gracious influences (Eumenides) at Athens was the grand climax of the story. The triumph of equity and clemency[6] over stern justice, and of compassion[7] for the sufferer over the Law's revenge, marks the highest development of the Greek spirit, disciplined in the stern school of adversity and triumphant over troubles, and the benign nature of Athens, "most devout of cities,"[8] empowered to succour and to save the desolate and oppressed.

[1] *τὸν πάθη μάθος θέντα κυρίως ἔχειν* ("Agam.," 171-175).

[2] "Agam.," 241.

[3] *σωφρονεῖν* ("Eum.," 495). *Cf.* "'Tis held that sorrow makes us wise" (Tennyson, "In Mem.," c. xiii.).

[4] *αἴλινον εἰπὲ τὸ δ' εὖ νικάτω* ("Agam.," 137, 154); *cf. τὸ δ' εὖ κρατοίη μὴ διχορρόπως ἰδεῖν* (340).

[5] *διδαχθεὶς ἐν κακοῖς* ("Eum.," §§ 66 *et seq.*).

[6] *τοὐπιεικές.* [7] *αἰδώς.*

[8] *θεοσεβεστάτας* ("Oed. Col.," 260). We cannot pass from Aeschylus without a reference to his conception of a mediating GOD: "Do not

In Sophocles, as in the New Testament, we find a kinder view of life prevailing. The dread majesty of external ordinances and powers that compels obedience is superseded, but not removed, by the attractive charm of a Divine love and sympathy that wins our love and duty. Suffering is, indeed, an education,[1] and the soundings and probings of the human heart by sorrow and sympathy, chasten and refine in a milder school the human spirit which had learnt the first lesson of justice from the fulmination of Divine wrath. Yet none the less retribution is the law that prevails. The consequences of one sin can never be trammelled up; their course is unfettered and overwhelms innocent as well as guilty. Oedipus is "one more sinned against than sinning," yet he has sinned. And "hanging can not atone for this offence,"[2] he cries. "Neither Ister nor Phasis could purge with cleansing tide this house and all the shames it hides," said the Second Messenger, words strangely echoed in the speech of Macbeth—

> "Will all great Neptune's ocean wash this blood
> Clean from my hand? No; this my hand will rather
> The multitudinous seas incarnadine,
> Making the green one red."[3]

Red ruin falls upon his house. And even after the old man, humbled and chastened, and now sanctified by his sorrow, a venerable, pathetic figure, standing a suppliant at a stranger's gate, has made his strange passing, "not lamented nor in sickness or pain, but in a marvellous way for man,"[4]—a poetic compensation for the sufferings and

---

expect the issue of this woe until some god as substitute (διάδοχος) appear to bear thy sorrows, and enter gloomy hell and sunless depths of Tartarus" ("Prom.," 1047).

[1] παθηματα μαθήματα ("Herod.," i. 207).

[2] ἔργ' ἐστὶ κρείσσον' ἀγχόνης εἰργασμένα ("Oed Tyr.," 1375).

[3] Act ii., Scene ii., lines 60 *et seq.*

[4] "Oed. Col.," 1664.

grief he had endured—the curse proceeds on its relentless course. His sons die, each slain by his brother's hand. The awful consequences of one sin are depicted in a manner that impresses us with the inviolability of the moral order, and the fact that there is no earthly atonement for some sins. As Adam Bede said: "There's a sort of wrong that can never be made up for."

To pass on to the great literary artist of the Middle Ages, no poet has painted more realistic pictures of the punishment and pollution of sin than Dante. Sin, as in Homer, is moral blindness. The inhabitants of the city of woe are those who have the intellect's good for ever lost.[1] The first group described in the "Inferno" consists of the unhappy souls "who lived without or praise or blame, and were joined to that evil band of angels who nor rebelled nor loyal stood to GOD, but for themselves only." While the direst degree of sin in its moral blindness, its insensibility to GOD and pity, and its utter selfishness is represented by Lucifer, prisoner in a zone of ice, dead to all feeling, a loathsome object of horror and pollution, his every movement increasing his own misery and the torment of his followers. There are many stages between. For "no one becomes all base at once."[2] But as each soul grows worse it becomes more blind and more insensible to good.

> "That graceless life which made them vile before
> Now makes them blind to all perception."[3]

Moral obliquity as it advances leads to total moral blindness, the eclipse of the reason's light. And, on the other hand, "as each thing more perfect grows it lives more sensible to good and pain."[4] The environment of the sinner is adapted to his sin. The sensual are detained in a zone of darkness, which corresponds to the darkness

[1] "Ch' hanno perduto il ben dello intelletto" ("Inf.," iii. 18).
[2] "Nemo repente fuit turpissimus" (Juvenal).
[3] "Inf.," vii. 52.
[4] *Ibid.*, vi. 107.

of their mind; the violent are chastened in a zone of fire; the lowest zone of all is one of arctic cold, suggestive of the deadness of their moral nature. Remembrance, too, is punishment. As Francesca said, "The bitterest cup of sorrow is the thought of happier days in one's adversity."[1] So Aeschylus spoke of the "painful memory of woe" and Sophocles of the remembrance of trouble which added to the misery of Oedipus.[2] Accordingly, the poet makes provision for the removal of this trouble by representing the memory as sweetened and purified in the waters of Lethe. Man is now reconciled to his past; the remembrance of his sin is obliterated in the stream of Eunoe, which revives his fainting virtue; he becomes like a tree "renewed with green foliage," cleansed in spirit and prepared for his further journey to the stars. This is the grand note on which the "Purgatorio" closes, as the glorious finale of the "Paradiso" is "the love that moves the sun and other stars," in which as in one volume all things are bound up.

The three poets we have mentioned were concerned with the satisfaction of the moral order, the inviolable sanctity of the Divine law of human life with its terrible reprisals. But conscience, too, demands satisfaction. This is the moral problem in which Shakespeare, George Eliot,[3] and Hawthorne[4] were supremely interested. The

[1] "Nessun maggior dolore
Che ricordarsi del tempo felice
Nella miseria."

("This is truth the poet sings—
That a sorrow's crown of sorrow
Is remembering happier things.")
(TENNYSON.)

[2] "Agam.," 172; "Oed.," 1318.

[3] "Working through all her plots is a stern, intelligent, unforgetting principle of retribution, which brings even the secret things of darkness into judgment" (Selby, "Theology in Mod. Fiction," p. 9).

[4] "Scarlet Letter: Twice Told Tale."

conscience, "seared as with a hot iron,"[1] has its own terrors and torments, which Juvenal describes so graphically in his thirteenth Satire,[2] where he speaks of "men held on the rack by a guilty conscience, whipped by its unfeeling lash, their mind its own tormentor wielding an invisible scourge." "A more terrible punishment than any devised by Rhadamanthus," he observes, "is to carry one's own accuser in one's breast by night and day. The very intention of sinning suffers the same punishment, for he who plans a crime is guilty of the deed. The crime haunts the criminal night and day, terrifies and unnerves him, and compels him to confess." This same Rhadamanthus is described in Lucian[3] as abandoning a tyrant to the lingering tortures of remorse as a severer sentence than instant death in flames. And Persius, in his third Satire, has conceived a yet more subtle form of punishment. "Great father of the gods," he prays, "be it thy will to punish cruel tyrants, whose mind has been envenomed with the poison of deadly lust, after this manner. Grant them a vision of virtue, and let them pine away for having turned from her."[4]

No poet, however, displayed a greater power than Shakespeare in painting the horrors of an awakened conscience, as none excelled him in describing the inner workings of the human soul in its passions, love, and hate,

[1] 1 Tim. iv. 2: κεκαυστηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν.

[2] 192 *et seq.*

[3] "Catapl.," 28.

[4] "Virtutem videant intabescantque relicta" (l. 38). To this Augustine, "De Mag.," refers: "Persius omnibus pœnis quas tyrannorum vel crudelitas excogitavit vel cupiditas pendit hanc unam anteponit qua cruciantur homines quia vitia, quæ vitare non possunt, coguntur agnoscere." See also Tacitus, "Annals," ii. 6, where he depicts the agonies of Tiberius: "What to write to you, or what not to write, may the gods and goddesses destroy me worse than they are at present destroying me, if I know."

lust of revenge, and disappointed rage. King Richard in his tent starts from his dream crying:

> "O coward conscience, how dost thou afflict me!
> . . . . . .
> My conscience hath a thousand several tongues,
> And every tongue brings in a several tale,
> And every tale condemns me for a villain.
> Perjury, perjury, in the high'st degree:
> Murder, stern murder, in the dir'st degree;
> All several sins, and all us'd in each degree,
> Throng to the bar, crying all—Guilty! guilty!"

Macbeth, in an even more pathetic passage, demands of the doctor who attends on Lady Macbeth:

> "Canst thou not minister to a mind diseased?
> Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow?
> Raze out the written troubles of the brain,
> And with some sweet oblivious antidote
> Cleanse the stuff'd bosom of that perilous stuff
> Which weighs upon the heart?"

And even the Adam of "Paradise Lost," for such an impossible person, displays a remarkable sensitiveness of conscience:

> "O conscience, into what abyss of fears
> And horrors hast thou driven me, out of which
> I find no way, from deep to deeper plunged!"[1]

His severest punishment is the thought of the misery and curse he has brought upon the race as yet unborn. And he is not satisfied until the vision of the Redeemer of the race reconciles him to his past, and he says:

> "Full of doubt I stand
> Whether I shall repent me now of sin
> By me done and occasion'd, or rejoice
> Much more, that much more good thereof shall spring,
> To GOD more glory, more goodwill to men
> From GOD, and over wrath grace shall abound."[2]

For Good is triumphant over Evil:

> "O goodness infinite, goodness immense!
> That all this good of evil shall produce,
> And evil turn to good."

---

[1] Book X. [2] Book XII.

Even so in Shakespeare "the soul of goodness"[1] is triumphant over "things evil," and Prospero at last sees his enemies repentant. And reconciliation is wrought out in bitterness and tears.

But perhaps the most terrible picture of a conscience-haunted man is Dickens's narrative of Bill Sikes pursued by the wraith of poor murdered Nancy: "Let no man talk of murderers escaping justice and hint that Providence must sleep. There were seventy score of violent deaths in one long minute of that agony of fear." From such a condition of perpetual terror, agonising suspense, haunting images, the unexpected, awful death he died were a welcome release. For him and his awakened conscience there could be no reconciliation on this side of the grave.

Such scenes as these bring vividly before the reader's eyes the fact that the real punishment of sin is sin itself, its bitter memory, the fears it engenders of future retribution, for "the sting of death is sin," and, worst of all, the character it develops. The law of retribution is a law of moral life, and works itself out in the formation of one's character which is one's destiny. According to the old saw:

> "Sow the act and reap the habit,
> Sow the habit and reap the character,
> Sow the character and reap the destiny."

This is the underlying idea of the Hindu doctrine of transmigration, and the "Karma" of the Buddhist's view of old sins shaping a new life.

But such retribution, though inevitable, does not interfere with our moral freedom and responsibility. It is not necessity, though it be the necessary result of a freely acting personality.[2] Otherwise there would be no re-

[1] "There is some soul of goodness in things evil" ("Henry V.," Act v., Scene i.).

[2] Guilt is identified by Bradley ("Ethical Studies," pp. 3 *et seq.*) with "answerableness," "imputability." The will is regarded as

morse, no self-accusing conscience, no torment of an envenomed and embittered memory. For our characters are not so much the resultant of two opposite forces, our action on the world and the world's action on us, as the product of the way *we allow* the world to act upon us and the way *we will* or *will not* act upon the world. Personality includes a mystery within as well as a mystery without.

Thus we are responsible for our actions and the different ways in which we put forth our essence and exert our influence upon the world; as we are also to be held accountable for the manner in which we permit the world's life to influence ours, both in its independent action as temptation and in its reaction as causing suffering. The law of retribution is not fatalism, for it is a destiny brought upon man by his own action; it presupposes the free personality and responsibility of man. We are not Omarites because we hold it true, with Matthew Arnold, that there is a "Power, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness."

In the light of the law of retribution sin is, in the first instance, a disturbance of the relation between the Lawgiver and His subject that must be set right. This is in the order of GOD.[1] In the second place, it is a breach in the relation between man and man that must be made good. This is in the order of man. In the third place, it is a rupture of the personal relation between the FATHER and His child which can only be healed by love returned.

---

cause, hence *αἰτία* is used of guilt in phrases like to "acquit of guilt." The deed must issue from a man's will; the *ἀρχή* is in himself. He must be the identical person throughout, and also the cause and origin of the deed, if he is to be responsible for it.

[1] This is a higher view of sin than that held by the æsthetic school of Plato and Shaftesbury, to whom it was the opposite of the beautiful (*τὸ καλόν*).

This is in the order of CHRIST, than Whom the law of GOD had never a stronger advocate.

Retribution and compensation are the laws of Nature, and therefore the laws of Nature's GOD. For as we sow we reap. And yet we have been taught, and we believe, that a new process can be set up in the heart of man, by which it can be freed from the fetters of the past and a holier character be formed. We are punished and yet we are pardoned for our sins. This is one of the antinomies of the faith upon which the parable of the Prodigal Son and the Elder Brother throws a light, by showing that the FATHER'S pardon does not set the FATHER'S law aside, though it causes it to lean to mercy. In this parable human life with its sin and its sorrow is represented no less ethically than dramatically. Reality is the relation between GOD and the human personality, not as an isolated unit, but as an individual member of a race of which the members are related to each other and to GOD. The relations of GOD to man are personal, and therefore ethical and universal. They represent a moral order or constitution. The wilful disturbance of such relations by one man deranges the whole constitution, the universal order outside of which man has no true life and is unable to develop in the image of GOD. The problem here is the restoration of that universal order—the reaction of which against the interference is expressed in that protest of the elder brother, which proves that pardon is no light matter.

Two phases of that restoration—the sorrow of the sinner towards GOD and the forgiveness of the FATHER, His love towards His child—indicate a change of the sinner to his sin and to GOD, and of GOD to the man and his sin. Hence a new relation is formed, in which a recuperative influence arises which can make the sinner a new creature, and thus the restoration of the sinner to the

Divine life restores the constitution of GOD as far as the sinner is concerned.

There is nothing forensic, external, or judicial in this relation, which is essentially moral and spiritual, and consequently is the basis of real life, on the integrity of which the inner development of that life depends. The law that is broken is not a statute external to man and GOD, but an intimate, vital relation of GOD to man which is expressed in the holiness of GOD and the righteousness of man. Regarded from this standpoint, forgiveness is not violation, but vindication of the law.

However it be denied, atonement is implied in the story, the FATHER'S Atonement that issues from His love and His sense of responsibility or His faithfulness to man, and exhibits both His righteousness and His love. The prodigal returning in penitence from his life of transgression learns the depth of a FATHER'S love that met him halfway, going forth to save and restore, and the sublimity of a FATHER'S pity that pardons and reconciles, and his soul is transfigured in the halo of Divine forgiveness and transformed in the breath of Divine love.

Owing to the difficulty of reconciling a certain "theory" of the Atonement with this parable, a writer in the *Expository Times*[1] has been found to argue that the FATHER in the parable is GOD the SON. This were indeed to create a dualism or schism and to overlook the fact that it is GOD *in CHRIST* that reconciles and forgives.[2]

Penitence rather than propitiation is the theme of the parable. And this penitence itself is something more than the penalty of the law. It is the human soul entering into the Divine sorrow for sin owing to the Divine SPIRIT working upon the human spirit and causing the man to feel disquietude, unrest, and dissatisfaction. The soul that can suffer for sin is not lost, but alive. Its very suffering is the

[1] February, 1907. [2] 2 Cor. v. 19; Eph. iv. 32.

surety of higher capabilities and possibilities, and is a proof that the man has made progress beyond the stage in which he was content with a lower moral condition and ideal, is a sign that he has become aware of what sin is in contrast with the higher moral life of GOD.

Anything that can awaken this feeling in man, the very working of relentless law, is beneficial, is a grace of GOD. Whenever a man can suffer for his sins, there is hope for him ;[1] and even if that suffering does not take place in this life, the very doctrine that the impenitent must suffer for their sins is a hopeful one for them, for the possibility of such suffering means the possibility of purification. The cases of a complete atrophy of the moral sense are so few in comparison as to prove abnormal. The conception that such a condition can be attained is more harmful to morality than the idea that the conscience, however stifled, cannot be eventually silenced, and will torture the unhappy man who has turned a deaf ear to its voice.

Assuming this, does the parable square with the psychological account of what is known as the conviction of sin ? It was the man's physical distress that led him to a moral dissatisfaction with his condition. Is this true as the general rule ? The man's finer senses had been dulled and blunted by his excesses and indulgences ; he had been rapidly sinking into a state of moral insensibility. Like the Lucifer of Dante, his soul was frozen in a zone of arctic cold ; its sympathies numbed and his personality mortified. In this state he could be said to be neither morally alive nor dead. Then his physical senses are

[1] "At last I heard a voice upon the slope
Cry to the summit, 'Is there any hope ?'
To which an answer peal'd from that high land,
But in a tongue no man could understand ;
And on the glimmering limit far withdrawn
GOD made Himself an awful rose of dawn."
(TENNYSON : "The Vision of Sin.")

suddenly awakened by physical pangs. Bodily indulgences had led to his moral fall; bodily needs now lead to his moral recovery. This is often the case. Man cannot be divided into airtight compartments, with one faculty that wills, another that feels, another that knows, another that condemns. Psychology demands some synthesising *ego*—some centre of personality, that unifies and distinguishes its sensations and movements, as physical and psychical, ethical and spiritual. But it is quite possible that as the spiritual is a development of the psychical—as St. Paul said, "first that which is psychical, afterward that which is spiritual"[1]—the moral may be a stage evolved—through the activity of the Divine SPIRIT—from the physical. It would be in keeping with this to find that an appeal to man's feelings—to the more superficial and clamant side of his personality—might eventually stir him to his inmost soul. This is at least the purpose of physical punishment, which often makes a man regret his folly and thus brings him to see that folly in a new light as moral degradation, a separation from the source of the moral ideal, the moral law, the moral life in GOD the FATHER. "FATHER, I have sinned against Heaven and before Thee, and am no more worthy to be called Thy son."[2]

The revelation CHRIST gave of the character of GOD as holiness and love is held by many to be the chief power in moving men to repentance. But where the preaching of that love has failed to impress, the pains and retributions of the law have stirred their hearts to a godly sorrow. The distressing results of one's own wrong-doing awaken the soul, and the Divine SPIRIT convincing of sin, righteousness and judgment, quickens it to behold the difference between what is and what might have been, and perfects the repentance. Here is a religion ethical in its nature,

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 46.
[2] Forsyth, "The Cruciality of the Cross," p. 46.

genius, and effect, something more than a morality suffused with piety. If people complain that the centre of gravity has been transferred from the Cross to the parable of the prodigal, they are to be reminded that it is only in the light of the Cross, the bearing of sin and all that it implied, the anguish and sympathy of GOD—that we understand the parable of the Crucified. The ill-desert, the punishableness of sin can only be realised when it is viewed from such a standpoint.[1]

The parable presents a study in contrasts. The sinning but repentant brother is confronted with the brother who has presumably nothing to repent of. The scope of the parable, which is for all and all time, is diminished by the general tendency to hold up the latter's conduct to scorn and contempt. And yet he is something more than the figurehead of respectability; he is the spirit of the law that has been broken by the Prodigal. He represents the sanctities of life that have been trampled on by the sinner. He stands for the punishableness of sin, its ill-desert. He is the violated trust, the betrayed friend, the broken heart and the ruined life which the profligate ever leaves behind. His brother's guilt was great; it was not to be treated lightly. Home ties snapped and human relations broken call forth the angry remonstrance of the law. The brother's denunciation of the brother's sin makes the Father's forgiveness appear all the greater, and so the form of justice sets off the beauty of mercy.

Sin is only to be spoken of in superlative terms. As we have seen, we are not free to choose the evil. We dare not trample on the laws of Nature; for Nature avenges herself. Bad-living parents bequeath to their children feeble constitutions, and sin ever results in some form of

[1] "There is something further in the idea of our practical reason which accompanies the transgression of a moral law—namely, its *ill-desert*" (Kant, "Theory of Ethics," Abbott, p. 127).

pain. We dare not trample on the laws of Society—the moral and social world in which we live and have our being as persons—for Society will not tolerate such conduct. And yet men are found to trample upon the laws of GOD. History warns us that such a course has always ended unhappily for the nation as well as in the case of the individual. Men are not free to act as they choose. If they think they are they must endure the consequences. The stern, unpitying figure of the law, the outraged spirit of Society, stands by their side. From him they can expect no mercy, even if they sin but in thought. But there stands by their side another Elder Brother, One Who loves them, One Who gave Himself for them, One Who watches over them, waiting for the first thought of lost happiness to convulse the soul, and for the godly sorrow that worketh repentance not to be repented of, and then prepared to lead them to the FATHER, Who is ever ready to meet sinners half-way. It is He Who sets a man at one with himself. For He stands between the living and the dead and stays the plague of sin. And by Him the law-breaker is set at one with the law, the prodigal son with the elder brother. The law dare not press her full claim when the lawgiver forgives. The outraged sanctity of the law veils its face before the wounded but atoning divinity of love. But mercy does not interfere with morality of which it is the true motive. Mercy wins men to obedience, and thus becomes the support of the law which is summed up in the word—love. GOD'S Heart forgives when He brings back His child to His own Will. But, on the other hand, the evil consequences of sin are in evidence everywhere, even in the homes and lives and children of the forgiven. There seems to be no legal absolution in the world. Here the unconditional freeness of the Gospel suffers check. The natural consequences of man's sin, ruined health, character and family,

still work on their unhappy course until the man's own better self begins to restore what he had ruined. But the spiritual consequences of sin, estrangement and separation from GOD are annihilated and absorbed in the great reconciling love that not only atones but inspires and empowers to lead a new life. GOD'S law relents not while GOD'S love redeems. Here is a great mystery, in the solution of which men were led to conceive a dualism within the Godhead. The clue to the mystery seems to be here. Although there is no legal absolution in the world, there is a Divine absolution, which does not cancel the penalties of the law, but makes them serve a higher purpose than retribution—even the redemption of man—so that they act upon a man's soul like those saving forces which Nature, that is said never to forgive, puts forth to restore. And the FATHER'S "Absolvo te," the FATHER'S kiss of peace, takes away all the terrors of the judgment, removes all the bitterness of the remorse, puts away all the shame of the confession, and converts the punishment—which must be borne until we have completely exhausted its power to pain and hurt—into a chastening discipline—a purification for the soul in a much higher sense than that purification of the emotions by fear and pity gained by the contemplation of tragic issues of which Aristotle wrote.[1] That Divine absolution is only checked by the obdurate and impenitent heart, the state of mind which turns from the manifestation of the perfect purity and unselfish love of GOD in CHRIST, which resents the convincing work of the HOLY SPIRIT and the Holy Life of CHRIST by which He judges mankind—which is sin against the Spirit of Holiness Who reveals the Incarnate One to man. For that state, so long as it continues, is at enmity with GOD and unable to receive the Divine forgiveness, which is thus

[1] Aristotle, "Poetics."

limited, not by the Divine Will of GOD, but by the evil will of man.

On the other hand, pardon restores the penitent heart to purity, forgiveness gives forth strength to the humbled spirit, and love leads the longing soul to wisdom. But purity, strength, and wisdom are the constitutional principles of the law—the principles that exalt a nation. The FATHER'S pardon does not, therefore, set the FATHER'S law aside, but it makes men strong and pure and wise, and so fit to keep the law and live the higher life where there is no elder brother's protest because there is no prodigal son. The FATHER'S forgiveness thus proceeds from love, works through love, and ends in love, for love alone can keep the law of which it is at once the foundation and fulfilment. This represents no schism in the Godhead, for the Cross of JESUS leads to the Holy FATHER, and GOD was in CHRIST reconciling the world unto Himself. And that GOD is not really GOD because He loves and pities and "His compassions fail not," but because He can subdue all hearts to His holy will, and His pardon is not an amnesty, but a restoration.

The conclusion is that men suffer the consequences of their deeds, but that another law intervenes, not between the earthly consequences of evil and their cause, but between the spiritual taint of evil and the repentant sinner. The sense of forgiveness lightens the load of sinners, removes the torture of a guilty conscience, binds up a broken heart, not directly by removing the temporal results of wrong-doing, but by giving the spirit a recuperative energy by which men are able to recover themselves in GOD'S sight and before their fellow men. The soul must retrace its steps, but under new conditions, with the added responsibility of encountering a common evil as CHRIST encountered it, but more easy to conquer since He conquered it. So they shall share in the redemption of

the world, following in the steps of the Mediator, Who (1) as their Champion had the right to represent their cause and offered His best to the FATHER for them, and (2) as GOD's Champion, laid the highest obligation on man to obey, adore, and love GOD by offering man the best GOD could do for him—redemption, restoration, and new life in and with Him.

Of the fulness of His love He gave; the plenitude of His glory He renounced; all He could suffer He suffered; all He could give He gave for us as our champion and representative in one, that man might be awakened to a sense of sin as disloyalty to the Spirit of eternal holiness, and be restored to the image and likeness of GOD—that is, that the breach might be healed between the FATHER and the child, which was all of the child's making, so that the child might live henceforth for his Heavenly FATHER.

This is the meaning of the just suffering for the unjust to bring man to GOD. Forgiveness is, accordingly, more than a letting-off, a remitting of the terrors and remorse of an evil conscience. It is a giving forth of new energy, new power, new life. For it is a restoration of Divine favour which gives back Divine life. It is a removal of a state of separation from GOD by the knowledge and love of GOD imparted to man. GOD atoned Himself into this forgiveness, even as among men hatred is converted into love by working for an enemy. Forgiveness lies potentially in the propitiation of which it is a sacrament even as the new attitude to sin is a pledge of forgiveness. And propitiation is the turning of the Divine energy into another channel, the recovery of man. Forgiveness is the issue of the atonement of one's self and an enemy by suffering for him, the enemy realising and recognising the sacrifice made. Our sense of forgiveness is thus the result of our realisation of the SON'S Sacrifice and of the experience of the harmony created between GOD and man

in our case, by a living union with CHRIST. Accordingly, the principle of retribution is superseded but not rendered ineffectual by the Divine absolution. The latter is the woof and the former the warp in which the texture of our human life is woven. In many and mysterious ways they overlap and interpenetrate each other, but GOD is the weaver, and the woof of His Divine forgiveness converts the warp of legal retribution into the form of a cross—the symbol of redemption.

As man learned from the natural law of retribution to demand "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth," so he learns from this spiritual law of Divine forgiveness to relent and have mercy. GOD'S forgiveness is the measure and motive of our forgiveness. We are to act ourselves into forgiveness by suffering in spirit for those who have injured us. Thus we atone for one another, and the breach between man and man is healed by the law of CHRIST, Whose sacrifice becomes our sanctification.

Finally, it is only the FATHER Who can reconcile the cause of His law with the claims of His love. His mercy found a way by which the sinner might be forgiven and yet that His holiness should not be disparaged. GOD'S law is holy and just and pure, and awakens in man the sense of guilt and the need of pardon. It thus leads man to cast himself upon the love of GOD. And GOD'S love is supreme and moulds men to obey His law and bend their wills to His. Law brings a man to himself. Love leads a man home. If the Atonement of the SON was the manifestation of the FATHER'S holiness, it was also the revelation of the FATHER'S heart—and both are represented in the parable of the Prodigal Son. The penalties and sufferings of the past are obliterated in the joys of reunion. And thus what leads the soul of man to the holiness of GOD is the pledge of eternal life. And that is eternal love.

CHAPTER VII

FORGIVENESS

A TRUE conception of personality, which is, after all, the image of GOD, must underlie the three ideas of sin, punishment, and forgiveness. These are not transactions to be stated in arithmetical figures. They are relations of a person to a person, and may only be expressed in terms of a personality, and all three imply freedom of the human will, and consequently may only be imperfectly understood, for our experience is only familiar with them in an imperfect form. But yet this is sufficient to indicate the manner in which these ideas, sin, punishment, penitence, and forgiveness, may be perfectly realised.

Sin implies a personality acting freely. Animals do not sin. It is only a perfect, sinless personality that can realise to the full what an interruption, however temporary, of communion with the Spirit of Holiness involves, or what a rupture of the relations that exist between him and a GOD of love implies. The more perfect a man is the more keenly he dreads the slightest shadow between himself and GOD. Punishment is only explicable in relation to a conscious personality. We cannot punish a book, but we can the man who wrote it. Even the punishment of a dog implies the possibility of a personality. It is only within the personality that punishment can attain its end of reforming and restoring by being converted subjectively into penitence. Penitence

again is manifestly to be explained only in reference to personality. It implies an *ego*, conscious of self and sin—the prodigal came to himself—and one identical self throughout,[1] and is consummated in that self-identity of the *ego* with the law of holiness which is made possible by the influence of the Divine SPIRIT upon the human, causing it to cry: "I will arise and go to my FATHER." And it is this change in our personality that explains and justifies forgiveness by creating within us a forgivable character of soul which, just because it is thus created, cannot be said to earn the forgiveness, but to have it. And in this sense we are justified freely[2] by His grace. This forgiveness is a free gift because the grace of repentance is a free gift.

And yet it is true that forgiveness must have a justification. If GOD regards us "not as we are, but as we are to be,"[3] in the phrase of Augustine, it is because He believes in us and gives us credit for our intentions as well as for our actions. But it is not possible, morally speaking, that a loving righteousness—no matter how loving—could regard and consequently treat a man as being different from what he actually is, or as being better than he actually is. If it did so, it would cease to be righteousness and love. It were a moral calamity if the righteous FATHER could not distinguish between the saint and the sinner. If we are not ruled by a righteous love—a love whose chief characteristics are righteousness and a passion for it, a love that does not ignore or overlook the sin but expresses itself in a manner

[1] "The first condition of the possibility of my guiltiness or of my becoming a subject for moral imputation is my self-sameness; I must be throughout one identical person. . . . In the first place, then, I must be the very person to whom the deed belonged; and in the second place it must have belonged to me—it must have been mine" (Bradley, "Ethical Studies," 5-7).

[2] Rom. iii. 24.

[3] "Non quales sumus sed quales futuri sumus."

that is often painful to the human child—there would be a full and free licence to sin with impunity. For GOD to treat a criminal as if he were innocent were a wrong to GOD's law of holiness, His own holy character, His human family and the man himself, unless there were that in the man himself which identified itself with the broken law, which rose in judgment against the sinner, which caused pangs of remorse, which would gladly welcome punishment, if it could remove the agony of shame and self-humiliation, which left him no rest until he had arisen and gone to His FATHER. Otherwise, man would make light of a Ruler Who did not trouble to vindicate His law and Himself, and would scoff at His forgiveness.

Ideally, forgiveness is GOD's recognition of a new creature[1] in CHRIST, a recognition which implies both a remembering no more of his past, and an approval of his present state, a forgetfulness of us as past sinners, and a belief in us as possible saints. GOD then sees us "not as we are, but as we hope to be." "When GOD forgives our sins He forgives us in CHRIST JESUS, beholding not the sinner that was but the saint who is to be."[2] But perfect forgiveness is only realised by perfect penitence, and is consummated in holiness. And man's forgiveness of man, which is the outcome and expression of this Divine forgiveness, identifies the injurer, not with the injury, but with what he may yet become through the grace of GOD. And thus in the last resort, forgiveness is the expression of love—the Divine love as it educates, moulds, chastens and purifies, awaking to life the human love that looks for the best and prays for the best, even on behalf of murderers and slanderers. "FATHER, forgive them," is, therefore, the Divine model and inspiration of the prayer, "Forgive

[1] καινὴ κτίσις (2 Cor. v. 17).

[2] Rev. J. Watson, *Expositor*, May, 1899. He continues: "So that when He thinks of the Apostle He remembers not Saul the persecutor, but only sees Paul, the prisoner of JESUS CHRIST."

us, as we have forgiven." The centre of Christianity is forgiveness. The man who forgives is a man of strength; the man who is forgiven is a man of joy. It was this forgiveness, invoked and pronounced on the Cross by the dying SON of GOD, that made Christianity superior to all other religions, and the very culminating point of the FATHER'S revelation to His children.

In this connection it is to be observed that the general rule of Confucius—"What ye would not that men should do to you do not ye do to men"—is negative, whereas the Golden Rule of our Master is positive. It has been stated, "That Confucius is the author of this precept is undisputed, and therefore it is indisputable that Christianity has incorporated an article of Chinese morality."[1] Admitting for the moment the possibility that the knowledge of the Chinese philosopher had penetrated so far as Judæa —for which there is not the slightest evidence—his attitude towards an enemy shows the vast inferiority of his ethical system to that of the Sermon on the Mount, and as water never rises higher than its source, it is impossible to derive the ethics of that sermon from the Chinese classics. A man, Confucius taught, should not "live under the same heaven"[2] with one who had done him deadly wrong. And in opposition to his contemporary Lao-tsze, the alleged founder of Taoism, who taught "the returning of good for evil," Confucius said: "Recompense injury with justice and return good for good," whereas our LORD said, "Love your enemies." The vindictive spirit of the national psalms also proves that our LORD'S teaching was original among the Jews—at any rate in this, that He taught men to distinguish between the offence and the offender, and however they may hate and oppose the former, to make the

[1] Matheson, "Faiths of the World," p. 83.
[2] "Le Ke," Book II.; Legge's "Life and Teachings of Confucius," p. 113.

latter a subject for prayer and pardon. It was this new principle, and the manner in which it was exemplified by the early Christians, that caused the "new superstition" to spread through the cities and villages of the Roman Empire.[1] Hitherto the law had demanded retribution, but now the Incarnation proclaimed Divine forgiveness, and the Cross proved it to be a fact. And the sublime manner in which that forgiveness was exhibited first inspired men to forgive their brothers.

The Roman Cato, to whom the fatherly heart of GOD had not been revealed, had no inclination to pardon anyone who had trespassed against him. "Since I have never pardoned the faults of my own disposition, I could not find it easy to acquire the habit of forgiving the wrongs that come from the evil hearts of others," he wrote in his own stern way. The kindly hand of time, however, seems to have somewhat mellowed the human spirit, for some three centuries later Epictetus wrote in his "Encheiridion" "Everything has two handles, one by which it can be carried, the other by which it cannot. If your brother sin against you, do not look on him as one who has injured you, for this is the handle by which it cannot be carried, but as a brother, for by this you shall take it as it may be borne." These words, full of the Christian wisdom of "bear and forbear,"[2] were ineffectual in spite of their beauty, for they lacked the inspiration of a FATHER'S love. In this is apparent the superiority of our faith. And the Gospels can never be reduced to a system of amiable and cultured morality so long as the FATHER'S forgiveness is

[1] Pliny's letter to Trajan: "Neque civitates tantum sed vicos etiam atque agros superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est." Tertullian's "Apology," 37: "Hesterni sumus et vestra omnia implevimus urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, palatium, senatum, forum; sola vobis reliquimus templa."

[2] ἀνέχου καὶ ἀπέχου is the leading principle of Epictetus ("Gellius," xvii. 19, 6).

felt to be a motive as well as an example, and so long as the mystery of a FATHER'S love is felt to be a Divine principle rather than a poetic dream. Seneca dreamed such a dream. "GOD," wrote he, "has a fatherly mind towards good men and loves them greatly, and He saith, 'Let them be harassed with toils, with pains and with losses, that they may gather strength.'"[1] But his life is witness that He failed to realise the vital force and universal nature of that Fatherhood. His beautiful sentences were intended to adorn a diary rather than to grace a life.

In a very different atmosphere we move as we walk with JESUS through the cornfields and listen to Him as He tells how the FATHER cares for the tiniest of His creatures; how it is He Who clothes the grass, Who arrays the lilies of the field, Who feeds the sparrows, and causes His sun to shine and His rain to fall upon the evil and the good—mysteries of providential care only to be excelled by the mysteries of paternal grace. For as He Who manifested that FATHER'S love in His every deed and in His every word speaks of that FATHER'S love for the prodigal son, a new light shines upon the paths and faces of men, and a new joy and yearning vibrates through their very soul. To that FATHER we pray: "Forgive us our trespasses." And we do not pray in vain. GOD can forgive—nay, GOD is forgiving us all the time. Our heart and conscience declare it; His SON affirmed it, and we believe it. Man forgives his brother: shall not the FATHER pardon His child? It is not so much the power of the FATHER'S hand as the pathos of the FATHER'S heart that draws the straying ones back to His Home. It was the wonderful revelation of that Heart in the sorrow of the

[1] See further Farrar, "Seekers after God," p. 174: "GOD is near you, is with you, is within you."

SON, "crucified through weakness," that breaks the human heart and causes it to seek pardon and peace:

"'Tis the weakness in strength that I cry for; my flesh that I seek
In the Godhead!"

It is the FATHER'S forgiveness that wins our love, not our love that wins forgiveness.

That pardon is the panacea of all our woe. Of human experience the sense of sin and the need of forgiveness are universal elements. They lie at the root of all our sorrow and despair. The feeling of a ruptured friendship ever produces unrest and unhappiness. How much more does that of a broken communion with GOD, no matter how crude and inadequate our conceptions of Him may be! For we feel that we were made for friendship with GOD. The savage is terrified by an unknown fear, and the savant is pursued by a horrible dread, so long as his sin remains unatoned. This feeling found expression in the sacrifices of the pagan and the Jew. It is true that many have blunted their sensibility by a course of sin, which has now by the inexorable law of retribution become a second nature. But wherever human nature retains a spark of its original simplicity and humanity there is some sense and also some acknowledgment of transgression. This feeling is actuated in different men by different motives. In one man it is the dread of a broken law, in another the agony of a lost innocence, in a few the horror of ingratitude, but in the majority expectation of punishment. True education can never refine away that sense of guilt. A man may seek, like Eugene Aram, to banish the memory of his sin in the all-absorbing pursuit of science; he may palliate his crime with sophistical argument; he may carry a heart of stone in his breast; but no man can indulge much in reflection, and allow free play to his memory, without feeling more deeply the contamination and dreading more keenly the

influence of sin. The more our powers of head and heart are developed—for that is the object of true education—every form that neglects one or other of these departments being imperfect—the more alive we shall become to our need of forgiveness. The more refined a man's nature is, the more keenly sensitive he is to the sight of suffering.

> "Pity dwells nowhere with the ignorant,
> But with the wise, whose wisdom costs them dear,"

wrote Euripides, "the human." "My sympathy is aye with love, not hate," said the much-enduring Antigone. Sad experience taught the unhappy Dido to pity the unfortunate. It was the sight of suffering that caused a gentle Indian prince, six centuries before CHRIST, to make his great renunciation and to leave a happy home in the hope of finding a way to lighten the burdens of men. It was the overwhelming sense of the suffering that sin entails that induced a greater than Sakya Muni to make a greater sacrifice. But when the sin and suffering are our own, and we know it, we must long for some release, we must yearn for the possibility of return. It is at such times that the forgiveness of the FATHER gives a new lease of life to the spirit of man, no matter how inadequately it be realised.

It seems impossible for our limited intelligence to understand how the almost unlimited series of evil consequences, both physical and spiritual, is severed by this act of forgiveness. We have no means of measuring the effects of sin; we only know that they are irrevocable. We trust they are not irreparable. Sin can be forgiven; can it ever be forgotten by GOD or man, and will its results be ever finally and completely obliterated? Will it ever cease to bear a bitter Dead Sea fruit in our lives and our characters and the lives and characters of others? We cannot say. We are aware of the terrible

scars that sin makes in the conscience; we know how it undermines the foundations of our moral and spiritual life; we see its awful results in the degradation of the sinner and his victim. And yet, in spite of the belief of the modern mind that forgiveness is impossible, that it is "a violation, a reversal of law, and that no such thing is conceivable in a world where law reigns," we can cling to the hope that some day our sins and their consequences will no more confront us even in the field of memory, but will be so annihilated by the power of the Eternal FATHER, or so completely transformed into good by His love, that we shall not find a vestige of them to mar the holiness of the Heavenly life. Then truly GOD will be all in all. For with the sin, the cause of the separation, shame, and remorse, the results of that separation will be removed.

The pardon of GOD differs from human forgiveness in many ways. Human forgiveness can never obliterate the effects of sin on one's own character, and therefore is no remedy for the disease, whereas GOD'S pardon wipes out such results and restores to new life. It is thus a new creation. As Bishop Westcott has pointed out, "Forgiveness, in order to be complete, involves not only the remission of the penalty of the deed, but also the removal of the direct results of the act upon the doer . . . The exercise of such a power corresponds with a new creation."[1] Again, men forgive niggardly and conditionally, while GOD pardons freely and fully. His pardon is not arbitrary or given on any condition we can fulfil, although it can never be perfectly realised or consummated in this sphere of life. GOD is ever pardoning, eternally forgiving our iniquities. GOD in CHRIST forgives all who come to Him through JESUS CHRIST, all who are in CHRIST, Whose salvation is "unto the uttermost, for He

[1] "Epistle of St. John," note on "Sin."

ever liveth to make intercession for us."[1] And His forgiveness gives with the pardon for the past, the strength for days to come. It is not only release; it is purity and peace.

In the Old Testament GOD is said to be ready to cover or forgive sin after penitence and confession. "I will confess my transgressions unto the LORD; and Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin."[2] His anger, too, is said to be but "for a moment."[3] He turned it away Himself,[4] (1) for His Name's sake;[5] (2) for His own sake;[6] (3) in answer to intercessory prayer—*e.g.*, that of Moses, who made the cause of the people his own, and refused to be considered apart from those he represented,[7] and who "atoned"[8] for the sin of the people; and (4) in response to actions performed through zeal for GOD, such as that of Phinehas, who atoned (*wayekapper*) for the children of Israel,[9] but chiefly in connection with the promised Redeemer, "wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities."[10]

But in the New Testament we are taught to dwell rather on the forgiveness than on the wrath of GOD. Our LORD'S attitude to sin is a revelation of the FATHER'S attitude and forgiveness. The message He gave to His disciples was "the word of reconciliation"—*i.e.*, that repentance and forgiveness of sin should be preached in His name.[11] Here, too, we learn from parables of word and deed the freeness and fulness of Divine love. There is no condition for the reception of mercy but human need, no condition for the reception of pardon but human want. There is no taint of legalism or merit in the Gospel. Even if our own repentance and our own faith be made the conditions of

[1] Heb. vii. 25.
[2] Ps. xxxii. 5.
[3] Ps. xxx. 5.
[4] Ps. lxxviii. 38.
[5] Ezek. xx. 7; xxxvi. 25-33.
[6] Isa. xlviii. 9.
[7] Exod. xxxii. 14.
[8] Exod. xxxii. 30.
[9] Num. xxv. 13.
[10] Isa. liii. 5; *cf.* Isa. lix. 20.
[11] Luke xxiv. 47.

our pardon the purpose of the Gospel were frustrated. Our faith in GOD is not necessary to the existence of GOD'S love for us, not even to the reception of it. It is the result of our experience of His forgiveness which was manifested on the Cross of CHRIST, and which is the cause of our repentance, inspiring us to respond to so great a love. Our repentance is not the ground of our forgiveness. We are forgiven not because we repent in love, but we repent in love because we are forgiven. "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much; but to whom little is forgiven the same loveth little."[1] Love is spontaneous, or it is superfluous. It is self-sacrificing, or it is suicidal. The Cross was the manifestation of the forgiving love of GOD in CHRIST that goes forth to seek and save the lost, that always takes the initiative in the recovery of the sinner, moving him to repentance and sorrow.

In the New Testament, too, we learn that our great Representative, by making our cause His own, by refusing to be considered apart from us, made atonement for the children of men because He acted with a Divine zeal for the Name and law of GOD, which He magnified and exalted in His life, revealing it in His actions even as He manifested the Divine love in His life and word. Thus He made intercession for us; and thus He covered our sins, enabling GOD to regard us as new creatures in Him, not winning forgiveness for us, but making it possible for us, and Himself bestowing it. This Divine forgiveness propitiates human wrath and turns it into forgiveness. Resentment is a natural instinct; but forgiveness is a Divine impulse. GOD'S forgiveness is not only example but inspiration. Because He forgives us, we can and we must forgive. What the age requires is more real belief in the FATHER. We must go "back to CHRIST," back to

[1] Luke vii. 47.

the FATHER of CHRIST if we would have, I do not say more faith or more knowledge of GOD, but more of GOD Himself as He comes to us in forgiveness and new life. In the light of His love for us all humanity seems lovable. His love fills us with sympathy, and not only draws us nearer to Himself but also to our brethren—the sons of the same FATHER. His love for us by its expulsive power helps us to rise superior to the claims of the natural law of "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth," the law of *talio* —like for like—and to conquer our natural desire for compensation. Our FATHER'S forgiveness is thus a new motive, a new standard, and a new example of our forgiveness, another law of *talio*—grace for grace. And so the prayer, "forgive as we forgive," does not so much imply the condition of GOD'S forgiveness of us—for shall man's weakness limit the working of GOD'S mercy?—as suggest the consequence of that Divine pardon. And yet at the same time we cannot hope for mercy if we render none. The unforgiving heart of the forgiven debtor did not allow him to realise and retain his own forgiveness.[1] But it were folly to regard human forgiveness, weak, imperfect, and strained as it is, even the father's forgiveness of his child, as the pattern or the motive or the measure of the Divine, so strong, so full, so spontaneous. And yet human pardon is analogous to the Divine in the comfort and help it gives. The forgiveness that means renewal of love, restoration of confidence, reunion of souls, is life-giving. And such pre-eminently is forgiveness in CHRIST. The underlying thought to which we give expression in this prayer is rather: "May the measure of love that Thou dost bestow

[1] Matt. xviii. 33: "Shouldst not thou also have had mercy on thy fellow-servant, even as I had mercy on thee"; Eph. iv. 32: "Forgiving each other (χαριζόμενοι), even as GOD also in CHRIST forgave you" (ἐχαρίσατο); Col. iii. 13: "Forgiving each other, even as the LORD forgave you."

upon us be the ideal of ours; may we forgive each other as GOD also in CHRIST hath forgiven us."

For it is the nature of love to beget love, and of forgiveness to propagate itself. Accordingly, she who was forgiven much loved much. For love and benevolence in one man have always drawn out and strengthened a like disposition in another. The poet Tennyson has beautifully expressed this sentiment in his "Love and Duty":

> "Of love that never found its earthly close,
> What sequel?
> . . . . . .
> But am I not the nobler thro' thy love?
> Oh, three times less unworthy! Likewise thou
> Art more thro' love and greater than thy years."

We are united by such subtle chords of feeling, and the whole texture of humanity is interwoven by such delicate filaments, that men have often been found who have been so sensible of anything that touched another nearly that they have readily suffered on their behalf. The very desire to be of service to another is one of the most elevating influences in life, for "'Tis not what man does that exalts him, but what man would do."

And forgiveness is nothing unless it means sorrow and suffering. Great was the mental agony it cost our SAVIOUR to accomplish our Atonement. We can only forgive truly when that forgiveness has been the result of an effort. For to forgive really we must not only "let off" an injurer and forget his wrong, but also strive to befriend him. The true basis of forgiveness is sympathy, or fellow-feeling with him who has wronged us; a sense of our common humanity; common weakness; common sorrow; common sin, that surging in our hearts sweeps away all our pride and helps us to forgive.

But if love be the blessing, hate is the curse of our kind, and hate spreads like wildfire. The persecution of the early Christians by the Roman Emperors, the horrors of the

French Revolution, the Armenian massacres — these examples show what this passion of hate can perpetrate when incarnate in the mob or the man. And such examples are but exaggerated forms of our own petty quarrels and animosities. When we see them in the light of such a hideous consummation, we behold them in the true light which can both illustrate the terrible workings and reveal the appalling possibilities of this most frightful of all passions. Before man can return to GOD this demon of hate must be wrestled with and cast out in the Name of the LORD, for

> "One shriek of hate would jar all the hymns of heaven."

Out of this terrible crisis, when all that is best in man's nature contends with all that is worst, blooms a new life of love and forgiveness.

And love must in the end triumph over hate, for love is of GOD. The Spirit of Love may be likened to a dove brooding over the dark abyss of chaos and tumult, and leading forth by the light of her silver wings and her feathers of gold, a race of men to GOD'S law and loving government resigned. For everything that is pure, everything that is true, and everything that is holy, sings of love—love that is greater than hate, love that is stronger than death.

> "For one soul working in the strength of love
> Is mightier than ten thousand to atone."

Love is the greatest thing in the world; it is the supreme motive and the final cause of man. But it was the Master Who first made love a religion, an inspiration and a commandment. "These things I command you, that ye love one another."[1]

The religion of CHRIST was the only faith that could inspire its dying witnesses to bless and pray for those who

[1] John xv. 17.

were doing them to death. "LORD, lay not this sin to their charge," were the last words of Stephen, the first of that great band who glorified GOD in their death:

> "He heeded not reviling tones,
> Nor sold his heart to idle moans,
> Tho' cursed and scorned and bruised with stones.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> But looking upward, full of grace,
> He pray'd, and from a happy place
> GOD'S glory smote him on the face."

Thus GOD forgives us and helps us to forgive. The forgiving spirit alone retains the Divine forgiveness. Loving GOD as FATHER, the SON as SAVIOUR, and our neighbour as ourself, we shall receive the Divine forgiveness and retain it in so far as we forgive. "No one is ready for forgiveness who has not repented, and no one has received forgiveness who is not being sanctified."[1] But forgiveness has yet to be consummated in reconciliation.

[1] Watson, "Doctrine of Grace."

CHAPTER VIII

THE PRINCIPLE OF RECONCILIATION

THE Atonement may be considered in four chief ways :

First, as the manifestation of love, it proceeded from the FATHER'S love for humanity, energised in the SON'S love for humanity, and issued in the love of humanity for the FATHER and the SON. In this light we regard our LORD as the Revealer of the Universal Fatherhood. Here it is to be remarked that this prominent thought of our age is combated by Ritschl, who said, among other things, that "all men assuredly are not the children of GOD, but only the members of the community who already through CHRIST are reconciled to GOD."[1] This restricted view of the Divine Fatherhood is due to the unscriptural limitation of GOD'S love to the community of which CHRIST is the LORD,[2] and is manifestly inferior to Abelard's theory of the Incarnation and Passion as a revelation of the love of GOD for humanity calculated to awaken a reciprocal feeling for GOD in humanity.

In the second place, it may be regarded as a triumph, for it was the victory of the Cross, the triumph of Divine righteousness over sin and death. The Son of Man died to conquer all the forces antagonistic to the kingdom of holiness and love. "Be of good cheer; I have overcome

[1] Ritschl, "Leben," ii. 199.

[2] "Justification and Reconciliation," iii. 441; see "Faith and Fact," by Edgehill, p. 168.

the world," He said in His hour of apparent failure—words that have been verified by subsequent events.

In the third place, it was the realisation of the Divine idea, the fulfilment of the Divine purpose. And this, though it satisfied the FATHER, was far different from the satisfaction theory of Anselm. The FATHER was pleased to find His own SON the perfect expression of His own law, the perfect pattern of His own righteousness, the perfect response to His own love. "Thou art My beloved SON; this day have I begotten Thee." "Therefore doth My FATHER love Me, because I lay down My life." The FATHER'S Divine idea was consequently realised by the SON, Who was the FATHER'S idea of what man should be, and humanity's idea of what a GOD should be.

But it was also reconciliation,[1] or at-one-ment. Reconciliation is a term of cosmic significance. It is the fundamental principle both of philosophy and science. We can only rightly appreciate the fact when we realise the universality of the principle of reconciliation in human life and thought. The idea of union with GOD is the fundamental presupposition of philosophy, and the union of all things in the One—whatever that One may be—is the ruling principle of science. Men have ever yearned for a living and abiding union with the Divine, and for the fuller life that flows from such union. The direct effect of

[1] The correct rendering of καταλλαγή (Rom. v. 11), Atonement, but nowhere else in the New Testament. So R.V., A.V., 2 Cor. v. 19: "GOD was in CHRIST, reconciling the world unto Himself" (καταλλάσσων); *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 11: "Let her be reconciled to her (erring) husband" (καταλλαγήτω). In both passages a downward (κατά) reconciliation is implied. But our LORD said: "Be reconciled (διαλλάγηθι) to thy brother," διά implying mutual relationship and goodwill. In Shakespeare, atonement = reconcilement. So Tyndale, 1562 (2 Cor. v. 18, 19), has "the ministry of atonement" (A.V., reconciliation). Afterward ideas of satisfaction, reparation, and amendment were introduced into the word. Atonement in the original sense of "at-one-ment" or "reconciliation"—not "expiation"—is the secret of the Cross.

the Mosaic sacrifices was the reunion of the offerer with the congregation; but beneath those temporary and material symbols frequently lay, in the case of pious souls, the desire of the worshipper to be restored to the Divine life. Sacrifice is not always or in its essential idea connected with sin. It rather gave expression in its primitive forms to man's relation to GOD. The sacramental meal among the Semitic peoples, which, according to Dr. Robertson Smith, gave rise to the sacrificial feast on the one hand and the burnt offering on the other, expressed both the homage of the creature to the Creator and his affinity or kinship to GOD. With the development of the sense of sin another element—the desire for atonement and reunion—was introduced. But here we are only concerned with the desire for union and communion, which has always and everywhere been felt in some way by man, and which is the ruling idea of every religion. The desire for this union, which found its expression in many ways and divers manners (πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως), was completely satisfied in the Incarnation—a union of man with GOD which overcame man's unfitness and the evil in the race by the Divine life lived under human conditions. As such, as a pledge of GOD'S presence with His children, as a surety of the sanctification of our humanity,[1] the Incarnation itself answered the desire for atonement and reunion.

This can be made more apparent by a brief consideration of the manner in which this desire for union with GOD, as expressed in Greek philosophy, paved the way for the Logos doctrine of Christianity. The longing for some basal unity or unifying principle was keenly felt and widely expressed in the philosophy of Greece. In their efforts to avoid the dualism of GOD and the Universe—form and matter, rational and irrational—the Stoics fell into Pantheism, identifying the Creator with the creature, and

[1] "JESUS has become the surety of a better covenant" (Heb. vii. 22).

conceived the whole world as a great living Being, animated and rational.[1] And their ethical rule to live in accordance with Nature[2] really meant to live in accordance with this universal pervading reason or Logos, immanent in the world and present in germ in every man. Owing to their faith in this indwelling principle, the disciples of the Stoic were upheld by a self-reliance in trouble which is to be admired for its serenity and self-control rather than to be condemned for its scorn and selfishness. The idea of the immanent Logos was grasped by Philo and, blended with the Jewish word or *memra*, was utilised by him as the mediating principle between the transcendent GOD of his own system and the material world, as creator and judge. The Logos doctrine was thus a symbol of the synthesis of the discordant principles of the universe, the attempt to construct a bridge between the infinite and the finite, the Divine and human, so that the spirit of man might ascend to GOD. The doctrine was a witness of the very desire for the adjustment of all things in GOD. And if the system failed to reconcile GOD and man, it was not because it did not desire to accomplish that reconciliation, but because its postulates rendered such impossible. GOD and man could not be made at one in a system which is based on the remoteness of GOD, Who is conceived as completely transcendent and a pure Abstraction. Beings so disparate could never be united—quite apart from the question of personality. It was left for St. John the Evangelist to show how the reconciliation has been effected by the Word made flesh. The union between GOD and man, made in His image and likeness, is achieved by the GOD-Man. And the way for that union was paved by the doctrine of the indwelling SPIRIT. This thought is the starting-point for every system of such

[1] τὸν ὅλον κόσμον ζῷον ὄντα καὶ ἔμψυχον καὶ λογικόν ("Diog.," vii. 139).
[2] ὁμολογουμένως τῇ φύσει ("Stob. Ecl.," ii. 132).

reunion. It is the humanification of GOD that leads to the deification of man. The result of the indwelling SPIRIT of GOD[1] in us, the Spirit of Him Who raised JESUS from the dead, is sonship. "Ye have received a Spirit of sonship, in which we cry, Abba, FATHER. This Spirit beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of GOD."[2] We are made at one, united with GOD, through having the Spirit of JESUS, Who is One with GOD.

The indwelling Spirit in the life and nature of man was the leading thought of Alexandrian theology[3]—which was based upon St. Paul's great thought of the Divine eternal life of GOD that was manifested in JESUS CHRIST, and is ours through union with CHRIST[4]—and that thought is the key of the Incarnation and Atonement. It explains the purpose and the reason of both. The CHRIST of to-day is not the transcendent, remote Personality of Latin theology, to be approached by mediators, but He is

[1] Rom. viii. 14. [2] Rom. viii. 15, 16.

[3] Ath., "Dec.," 31: "Since the Word bore our body and came to be in us, by reason of the Word in us, GOD is called our FATHER"; "the SON in us"; "Orat.," ii. 59: "The Word of GOD became man to sanctify the flesh"; *ibid.*, ii. 10: "The Word dwelleth in us"; *ibid.*, ii. 61: "We rise from the earth, the curse of sin being removed, because of Him Who is in us"; *ibid.*, iii. 33: "By this indwelling He is the beginning of the spiritual life of His people"; *ibid.*, i. 48: "Our flesh has been sanctified in Him"; *ibid.*, i. 50: "Because of our relationship to His body, we, too, have become GOD'S temple, and are made GOD'S sons, so that even in us the LORD is now worshipped"; *ibid.*, i. 43: "GOD became man that we might be gods"; *ibid.*, i. 39 (*cf.* 2 Pet. i. 4: "that we may become partakers of the Divine nature"): "Our flesh having been made partaker of the Logos" (λογωθείσης); *ibid.*, iii. 33, *cf.* Irenæus, "Adv. Haer.," iii. 18, 6: "Had not man been united to GOD, he could not have shared in incorruption"; *vide* "Praef.": "JESUS CHRIST became what we are to make us what He is."

[4] 1 Cor. xiv. 25: "GOD is in us indeed"; Gal. i. 24: "They glorified GOD in Me"; 1 Cor. vi. 20: "Glorify, therefore, GOD in your body"; 1 Cor. iii. 16: "The SPIRIT of GOD dwelleth in you"; Col. i. 27: "CHRIST in you the hope of glory." *Cf.* John i. 14: "He tabernacled among (ἐν) us"; John xiv. 17: "He abideth with you, and shall be in you."

the *Deus Immanens* in human life Who unfolds the Divinity of GOD in human life as the principle of progress and the secret of the desire of humanity for GOD.

> ". . . For GOD dwells in all
> From life's minute beginning up to man,
> The consummation of this scheme of being,
> The completion of this sphere of life."

Such a CHRIST, Who establishes our union with the Divine nature, is the means of our reunion with GOD. The identification of the human with the Divine in His life is our Atonement. He has re-established our relation to GOD. He revealed our affinity to GOD. He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. The process of union is the process of realising that life in us. This is the Gospel of St. John. He that believeth on the SON hath life. He dwelleth in us. And He prayed "that they may be one, even as We are one, I in them and Thou in Me, that they may be perfected into one." Union and communion are the keynotes of the Gospel of the Lamb that taketh away the sin of the world. And this Gospel means that GOD united Himself with One Man—His Logos—so that all men in this their advocate may be one with GOD. The basis of union and reunion is an historic person, not an idea. He is both GOD and Man, the beginning and the end, the revealer of GOD, the consummator of mankind —through Whom we have access to GOD in one Spirit.

The Logos doctrine of the Stoics and Philo is thus clothed with flesh and blood, and becomes a doctrine of a SAVIOUR and a Mediator, Whose presence makes the Christian religion what it is. And this doctrine serves to counteract the modern trend of thought—based on the Hegelian philosophy, which taught the essential unity of GOD and man, with its platitude, "the divinity of man and the humanity of GOD," in which system reconciliation would mean reconciliation to oneself. The theory of life

offered fails to account for CHRIST'S consciousness of Himself, for to realise that consciousness in a small degree is to realise not only our affinity to GOD, but also our separation from Him ; to realise not only our own imperfection, but our incapacity to be better if left to ourselves; to realise, in a word, the need of a reconciler, if we would be at one with GOD ; and further, to desire that that division between the Divine and the human should be overcome in one reconcilement by a unity that transcends the antagonism between GOD and man, and reconciles them into one—even the Mediator between GOD and man. For thus only the way is prepared for that faith in the Incarnation which enables men to realise that however remote they may be from GOD, they are not hopelessly divided, and to grasp the fact that if GOD has been brought nigh to man, man has been raised high to GOD.

In this connection a protest is to be made against that Hegelian idealism which, assuming the essential relation of GOD and man and the inevitable nature of sin, renders such an Atonement or reconciliation as we hold unnecessary; and also against the Ritschlian view[1] that the Gospel of the forgiveness of sins does not remove the feeling of guilt for past sins, but only the effect of this in separation from GOD, or the distrust of GOD inhering in it,[2] for we believe that when the reunion or reconciliation between GOD and man is consummated in CHRIST, the sinner is reconciled to himself and his own conscience.

Furthermore, philosophy and science assert the unity, continuity, and solidarity of life (all life) and thought (all thought), and find the solution of the fundamental problems in the reconciliation of apparent antitheses. Life

[1] *Cf.* "Justification and Reconciliation," iii. 58: "The removal of guilt and of guilt-consciousness would be in contradiction to the validity of the rule of truth for GOD, as also for the conscience of the sinner."

[2] *Ibid.*, iii. 513.

itself is the result of the gradual blending of antagonistic forces, vitalism and mechanism, the ego and the non-ego, and depends for its continuance on the preservation of the balance of power between mutually conflicting elements and laws in natural, moral, and spiritual life. This in itself is suggestive of a unity underlying and transcending differences, absorbing inconsistencies, without which there could be no meaning or connection of thought, feeling, or will.

To particularise, the law of *contradiction*—as laid down by Aristotle—is limited by another law, the law of *relativity* as expounded by Hegel. There can be no real self-identity of things which excludes their communion in a world of thought. Difference without relation is self-contradictory. Difference presupposes unity. Negation and affirmation involve and complete each other in an intelligible world, in which the antagonisms of thought must be reconciled. Definition includes in its attempt to exclude. Limitation involves relation. For distinction as well as comparison there must be some unity which underlies, transcends, and reconciles. Objective and subjective, mind and matter, thought and fact, external and internal, are reconcilable in an ultimate unity which lies deeper than the antitheses of logic. Consequently in the world of thought an unrelated thing is self-contradictory. Knowledge is relative. Philosophy knows nothing of the Absolute. It deals with relations, its laws are relative, and it is concerned with the association and relation of ideas. There must be some identity or unity which transcends and is immanent in the differences of things if they are to become ideas. For what cannot be distinguished or defined cannot be thought, and things can only be defined in terms of one another. Into the mind neither things nor ideas in the concrete or the abstract may enter unless related to some thing or idea in the concrete or abstract

already there. Thought itself implies a unity in and for which the manifold details of the universe exist, and by which its mutual antagonisms are reconciled.

This very fact that the mind will not receive into its system of knowledge or belief any event or fact unique and unrelated to anything else in human experience has been the very rock on which so many theories of the Atonement—the great reconciliation of GOD and man—have been shattered in their attempt to explain, from the standpoint of human experience and the analogies of human life and thought, what absolutely transcends that experience and those analogies—the Atonement-process of GOD—by which He brought the world into harmony with His idea and His will. That process cannot be adjusted to or fall into its place in any human system. But as we view these things from a higher standpoint, we can see that they are part of one great scheme manifested in Creation, Incarnation, and Redemption; and so we reach a unity of thought, after all.

In the mind itself the unity of self-consciousness holds in equilibrium the antagonistic elements of thoughts and things, the ego and non-ego, subject and object, self and its environment, spirit and matter, from whose opposition are derived all the interest and development of intellectual life. Thought is consequently based upon a reconcilement of opposites, subjectively and objectively, in the world within and the world without. There is thus in our experience a unity which underlies the distinctions between nature and spirit, and in which they are resolved as aspects of the same whole. Instead of being mutually exclusive they interpenetrate each other. The same power that reveals itself in the conscience reveals itself in nature. And thus at the back of things there must be some ultimate unity if they are to be thought at all. And this unity is GOD.

Furthermore, the unity of nature is the postulate of science. The scientific impulse for unity is conspicuously displayed in the works of Haeckel, one of the greatest biologists of the last century. The root of the great tree of life is derived from one form of life. Life is traced back to a single cell—as in the Radiolarian—just as the solidarity of life is found exemplified in the Medusa—a cell state. He attempts to solve the riddle of the universe by trying to establish the unity of all natural forces, or the "monism of energy," and the unity of nature, organic and inorganic, or the "monism of the cosmos." Here the passion for unity rises to a cosmic scale. He concludes the *Morphology* with the words: "In recognising none but divine forces in nature, in proclaiming all natural laws to be divine, Monism rises to the greatest and most lofty conception of which man, the most perfect of all things, is capable—the conception of the unity of GOD and nature.[1]"

While it is to be regretted that this monism of the cosmos is established to proclaim the absolute dominion of the "great eternal iron laws," and to shatter what Haeckel terms the "three central dogmas of the dualistic philosophy—the personality of GOD, the immortality of the soul, and the freedom of the will"[2]—it is to be remarked that when attempting to arrive at an ultimate unity of the world or self or GOD, philosophy and science are working towards the same goal as religion. Indeed, the desire to grasp the world as a whole is something more than mere science, and betrays the interest of religious faith.[3] And, by a strange irony of fortune, men who refuse to worship a universal FATHER lose themselves in a cosmic emotion, an enthusiasm for humanity or a

[1] "Riddle of the Universe," chap. xiv.: "The Unity of Nature." The origin of life, according to Haeckel, is monophyletic, as opposed to the polyphyletic view.

[2] *Ibid.*, chap. xx.: "Conclusion."

[3] Edgehill, "Ritschlianism," p. 122.

"philosophy of unity." And those who renounce the so-called "anthropistic ideals of GOD—freedom and immortality"—are compelled to worship—because humanity must worship something—at the shrine of the "true, the good, and the beautiful,"[1] And those who repudiate the One GOD and FATHER of all are forced to take refuge in barren, hopeless, loveless Monism. While philosophy, in its attempt to harmonise for thought all reality in and with GOD, is fundamentally religious.[2]

In consequence of the unity of this cosmic view of the universe, due in a large measure to the cosmic extension of the principle of evolution, which, according to Professor Lloyd Morgan, "is winning or is to win all along the line," science will tolerate no such thing as unrelated matter. No single object can be thought apart from its environment or its setting. Much less can any single object exist in nature which has no relation to any other, which neither gives nor receives influence. It is from a perpetual conflict of forces, a constant clash of vortices of atoms that life is evolved. But as we have assumed some one power which gathers up and unifies these discordant elements in itself, just as the lights and shadows form one harmonious perspective, we consequently conceive the universe as one harmonious whole consisting of mutually-interrelated parts. Accordingly, even if biology tends to a physical explanation of personality—in spite of the fact that if there were nothing but physical life there would be no physical science—it is opposed to that atomistic conception of human life which places each personality in an airtight compartment by itself. And in this manner the solidarity of the human race, which is presupposed in every reasonable doctrine of the Atonement-process of GOD, is an evident corollary of the unity of Nature.

[1] "Riddle of the Universe," chap. xx.: "Conclusion."
[2] Hastings, "Dict. C. & G.," Kilpatrick, art. "Incarnation."

Again, in the moral cosmos there is no such thing as an unrelated will. Human society is the resultant of the perpetual clashing of a multitude of wills, and character itself is woven out of such opposites as doing and suffering, good and evil, joys and sorrows, hopes and fears, strength and weakness. The will of man is selfish and self-seeking, and although it can only influence and be influenced by other wills, in relation to which it energises and manifests its working, it is generally set in motion by some conception of what is its interest, regardless of the fact whether it be the interest of others or not. Yet no man liveth to himself or dieth to himself. Man cannot set himself free from the conditions of life in human society without combining the self-preservative instincts and forces of that society against himself. He cannot isolate himself either without losing his individuality or his sanity. This was the problem of Faust. He revolted against society and was saved from his splendid isolation, not by the beauty of a Helena or the pomp of royal state, but by the service of man, by acknowledging the very principle of self-sacrifice which he had repudiated in his former career. It is true that man's will must be perpetually conflicting with other wills if there is to be interest or development in his life. And there must be therefore some basis of union to reconcile and unify these discordant moral powers. Here the doctrine of the Atonement justifies itself; for the idea of a universal Atonement is the only idea that can and does bring about a mutual *rapprochement* between the various races and classes and kinds of men; a mutual surrender of one's own interests for the common good. And in the Universal CHRIST the interests and ambitions, the ideals and motives of the Church, which ideally is as wide as humanity, are included and realised.

And among other wills that can influence the individual

will is the higher, the universal Will of GOD, with which the individual will is as frequently in conflict. For the Divine purpose, though realised in the natural world, is thwarted in its self-realisation in the moral life of man, who refuses to be conformed to the Divine image and to submit to the Supreme Will. This antagonism of purpose between the human and the Divine could only be overcome in the life of One Who could and did make the will of man yield to the Will of GOD, and in Whom the Divine purpose was allowed to realise itself. And He was the SON of GOD and the Son of Man. In Him alone the radical distinction between the human principle of selfishness which makes for separation, and the Divine principle of self-sacrifice which makes for reconciliation, was removed, and the will of man was identified with the Will of GOD. The purpose of CHRIST, which might be expressed in the words, "Lo! I come to do Thy will, O GOD," reconciled these opposites and produced peace in the soul of man, because He created a harmony in which the opposition of man to GOD'S will was wholly overcome, and man was brought into complete accord with GOD.

The principles that have been laid down and the conclusions which have been reached will materially aid us in the consideration of what the Atonement in its aspect of reconciliation signifies.

CHAPTER IX

THE RECONCILIATION OF CHRIST

RECONCILIATION is more than forgiveness: it is rather forgiveness consummated in harmony. Forgiveness implies a restoration of broken relations, but reconciliation involves the reorganisation not only of the individual, but of the community of the world. In its various aspects of appeasement of the wrath of GOD and man, of reconciliation with the community and oneself and the world-order, it is the theme of the poets as well as of the prophets and apostles. And of these aspects, reconciliation with one's past—one's memory—one's higher self, is chief. This was the problem of Dante, who suggested the solution in the vision of the eternal light in which he saw bound up in one volume with love all that the world contains, so fused together as to form one single light. Three orbs are discerned in that light, and in the second he perceived what appeared a human form. It seemed to be painted with an image, but he could not see how the image was conformed to the circle or found itself therein. This was beyond the flight of his wing.[1] Yet he gives us here the true explanation of reconcilement, which does not lie in forgetfulness of one's sin, but in the possibility of seeing all the mistakes and errors of the past merged in that eternal light and turned to good, and to see CHRIST in humanity and humanity in CHRIST. This is the great reconciliation.

[1] "Paradiso," Canto xxxiii., 67-145.

For the consequences of man's sin must be overcome and converted into good or ever a man can possess a still and quiet conscience, or ever he can have a contented mind, or ever he can discern "the soul of goodness in things evil." In the parable of the Prodigal memory is not mentioned; and yet there is no peace for the Prodigal until his memory has been cleansed. Forgiveness is not adequate. He cannot forgive himself while there is a single soul who is suffering through his sin, through the contagion, influence, and example of his evil doings. He hath no rest until the sin has been completely conquered in his own heart and the consequences of his evil doings have been transmuted into good, not only for himself but for all concerned, until all things have been gathered up and, as it were, bound together in one volume of atoning love.

Neither can there be complete reconciliation on GOD's part with the sinner so long as His beneficial and universal purpose is hindered and thwarted by the other's sin. And until He has made the evil of the world subservient to His own good and great ends, He cannot be reconciled to humanity. And as surely as there is a moral order by which nature is constituted for virtue, we believe that the good will triumph over the evil, for good is stronger than evil. The good man is a stronger man in character than the bad man, no matter how violent he be, because of the memory of his sin. And our LORD has confirmed our hope and belief by His own words, spoken as the Representative of GOD to man: "Be of good courage; I have overcome the world."[1]

There are, accordingly, many things to be taken into account in a theory of perfect reconciliation which requires an Atonement that is more than the "satisfaction" of either Thomas Aquinas or Duns Scotus.[2] It means the

[1] John xvi. 33.

[2] Aquinas held that the satisfaction of CHRIST was "superabundant"; Scotus, that it was merely an *acceptilatio*, or discharge,

destruction of sin and the conversion of its consequences into good. The suffering GOD is the key of the problem. The Eternal CHRIST, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, makes the eternal Atonement. He has borne and He ever beareth the sin of the world, in order to subdue it and eradicate it wholly from His Universe. Calvary was a glimpse of the sufferings of Deity, the rift in the cloud that for one brief moment allowed to flash upon the souls of men the sorrows of Divine love, a self-revelation of an eternal process under conditions of space and time. Thus in Him we have redemption through His blood, even the remission of sins, Who is the image of the invisible GOD, the firstborn[1] of every creature, because in Him all things were created, both the things in heaven and the things on earth. All things have been made through Him and unto Him, and He is before all things, and in Him all things consist. And He is the head of the body, the Church.[2] For the Church is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.[3]

This grand conception of a cosmic, eternal CHRIST raises us up above the transactional and transitory, forensic and fictitious theories of Atonement to the vision of a Suffering GOD, Who has borne all the sins of men, Who has felt all the sorrows of men in His great heart ever since the creation of man, Who is not only immanent in the Creation but also is immanent in humanity, and is penetrated by the sins and sorrows of the race, which are His because it is He Who is the Head and primal principle of its life, goodness, and joy, the transcendent, indwelling and eternal CHRIST.

If GOD is the FATHER of the Christian's creed, and not the Demiurge of the Gnostics, He cannot be defeated;

---

having no intrinsic merit of its own, but only the value GOD chose to give it.

[1] *Cf.* Heb. i. 6. [2] Col. i. 14-18. [3] Eph. i. 23.

His sorrows must eventually turn into joy, the joy of a redeemed humanity, a reconciled and restored universe. Anticipatory glimpses of that final triumph, more fully revealed in the Apocalypse, are found in the Fourth Gospel. "And I, if I be lifted up, shall draw all men unto Myself." "I have overcome the world." The fruits of victory are not yet to be reaped, but the seed of victory hath been sown, and it will blossom gradually unto the perfect day when CHRIST shall have subdued all things unto Himself and GOD will be all in all. Then the reconciliation of the world will be fully consummated in GOD.

In the meantime, the CHRIST immanent in humanity feels the consequences of our sins. He identifies Himself with our sins; feels them as His own; makes them His. But coming against His strength, their power is stayed.[1] They are drowned in the sea of His love; they are trampled down by the progress of His kingdom of righteousness; they are completely and wholly subdued by His Divine Will. And as there is a recuperative energy in nature and in human life, a healing power at work in the human body and the body politic, conquering and expelling the forces that make for harm, there is a power working for righteousness in us, though not of us; a purifying, strengthening Love, which converts our failures and defeats into steps unto heaven—a Divine Reason indwelling in human thought, a Divine righteousness unfolding itself in human life.

[1] *Cf.* Luther's description: "Sin is the greatest, mightiest god who draws the whole human race—all learned, holy, mighty, wise, unlearned men, etc. This, I say, runs upon CHRIST, and wills to devour Him like all others; but it does not see that He is the person of unconquered and eternal righteousness. Therefore it is necessary in this war that sin should be conquered and slain, and that righteousness should conquer and live. So in CHRIST universal sin is conquered, is slain, and is buried, and righteousness remains eternally victorious and regnant."

There is, however, no reconciliation without satisfaction. And there must be compensation for every wrong if there is to be a union of spiritual beings. Anselm expressed a truth when he described sin as a dishonour to GOD. For if there is to be forgiveness in a moral universe, it cannot be at the expense of the sanctity of the law. This must be upheld, for it is the righteousness of GOD.[1] But the payment of a debt of honour is all inadequate when the destruction of that which dishonours is required. And this the indwelling CHRIST is doing, cleansing and making good the sinner, overcoming mortal sin by His immortal life and emending its injurious consequences in humanity, bringing to naught the powers of darkness. Not the substitution of a victim, not a vicarious suffering, but the victory over sin achieved by the CHRIST in humanity, the glorious accomplishnent of His grand purpose for humanity by the CHRIST in humanity, the overcoming of that which impeded the course of His great love—which is now "to fill infinitude wholly," and the realisation of His Divine idea of a kingdom of GOD among men—these things satisfied the FATHER, because they meant the fulfilment of His great plan of Creation and Redemption; and satisfy man because they mean the cleansing of his conscience, the removal of the consequences of his sin, and the gift of a new life in CHRIST which satisfies us because it is the earnest of the final and crowning triumph of righteousness in us, and promises that peace and rest in GOD which is now bestowed upon us by the Spirit of Him Whose love is as invincible as His law is undefiled, and Who consequently helps us to overcome in His Name.

Consider now what reconciliation implies. In the first place and chiefly, it was GOD in CHRIST reconciling the world unto Himself, to His moral order, to His Divine,

[1] "Seek ye first the kingdom of GOD and His righteousness" (Matt. vi. 33).

holy will, winning man back to the service of GOD by His love and sacrifice, and by His HOLY SPIRIT convincing man of sin and prompting him to believe in JESUS CHRIST, the SAVIOUR of men, to repent, and to be saved from the power of sin. This is the primary aspect of the Atonement as we study it from the Divine standpoint, *qua Deus nos sibi conciliavit*, which is the standpoint of the New Testament. "All things," as St. Paul wrote, "are from GOD,[1] Who reconciled us to Himself in CHRIST JESUS, and gave to us the word of reconciliation." The FATHER takes the whole initiative in the work of reconciliation, just as the method and motive of reconciliation are His supremely, His originally. GOD begins the work. He gave His Only Begotten to us. The work of CHRIST is already *un fait accompli*. GOD hath already reconciled us to Himself in CHRIST—that is, we are reconciled potentially, our sins are not imputed to us, so far as we are in CHRIST, by reason of the solidarity between the Son of Man and the sons of men. It was GOD Who provided the mercy-seat at which we can hold communion with Him. CHRIST did not change GOD to man, but man to GOD. "CHRIST suffered for sins once," wrote St. Peter, "*that He might bring us to God*."[2] And GOD in CHRIST wins us to Himself, overcoming our hatred by His lovingkindness, subduing our malignity by His mercy, and conquering our obstinacy by His patience and long-suffering. It was the Divine love and suffering as manifested in CHRIST that broke the stubborn heart of man, that brought men into oneness with GOD and one another, that brought man to himself and made him yearn for his FATHER'S home.

But is there not a sense in which GOD is reconciled to us? We read that the mind of the flesh is enmity

[1] 2 Cor. v. 18 (depositing with us the word of reconciliation; v. 19: θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν).

[2] προσαγάγῃ τῷ θεῷ (1 Pet. iii. 18).

against GOD,[1] but we do not read that GOD was the enemy of man or that He required to be appeased, propitiated, or reconciled. Such phrases as "propitiation of GOD" and "GOD being reconciled" are, as Bishop Westcott asserted, "foreign to the language of the New Testament."[2] Accordingly, that cannot be regarded as a plan to overcome GOD's hostility to man which was a provision—if the Atonement-process can be provisionally termed a provision—made by GOD Himself to overcome the hostility of sinners to Himself and remove the obstruction to their full communion with Him—even their sin.

The harsh views of GOD as sovereign ruler, aloof and remote from human life, needing propitiation and requiring to be mollified, to have His wrath taken away, have given place to milder and truer conceptions of a FATHER Who was present with His SON in all His sufferings, and Who was described by that SON as going forth to meet the sinning boy half-way and to receive Him to His heart and His home. GOD does not need to be reconciled to us. He is there, as it were, waiting to make friends. The SON leads us to Him. And in the SON humanity is made capable of return to GOD. And yet there is a sense in which there is a wrath[3] of GOD. For if love be thwarted it is turned in upon itself or into some other channel, until the object of its affection again allows it full sway. And this is the reconciliation of love in the sense that love is received. No change in GOD's attitude to the sinner is implied. GOD's character is unchangeable, but we cannot hold that He lives, like

[1] Rom. viii. 6. [2] "Commentary on the Epistles of St. John."

[3] John iii. 36: "The wrath (ὀργή) of GOD abideth on Him"; Rom. i. 18: "A wrath of GOD is revealed from Heaven upon all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who keep down truth in unrighteousness"; Rom. viii. 1: "There is no condemnation (κατάκριμα) to those who are in CHRIST JESUS, who walk not after the flesh, but after the SPIRIT.

the god of the Buddhists, in a colossal calm, or, like the deities of the Epicurean, in passionless indifference. For GOD cannot deny Himself, His own righteousness, and hatred of sin. And therefore the forces that would have gone forth from Him to bless and sanctify and develop human life were checked and thwarted, because the human co-operation with the Divine purposes which was necessary to their realisation was withheld by the froward use of man's free-will. The opposition to GOD'S love and mercy in the human heart had to be removed by the manifestation of a devotion to righteousness superior to death, and the outpouring of a Divine SPIRIT, convicting of sin and moving to goodness.

Accordingly, the vindication of GOD'S law by the SON and the SPIRIT is as necessary as the revelation of His love if that change in the moral life of the sinner is to be effected which brings him into accord with the moral life of GOD, and which is the means of his reconciliation. And that vindication implies an objective matter of fact, a positive dealing with sin. There was a real peace-making between Heaven and earth, a real conquest of sin in the human heart. And while we do not believe that the SON subdued the wrath of the FATHER by the perfection of His own obedience [1] and the urgency of His intercession, or that GOD in CHRIST was working down His own resentment and propitiating Himself to us, there was something more in our LORD'S work for us than a pathetic display of the FATHER'S love. For the moral effect of such a display—if it went no further—could hardly have had the power to convert and regenerate the souls of men. There was therefore something objective in the Atonement; not, however, in the sense that GOD had to be reconciled to us, but that we had to be reconciled to

[1] Dale, "Atonement," p. 357, where he cites Bushnell's "Forgiveness and Law" (p. 41) for the latter alternative.

His law as well as to His love. Accordingly, the secondary aspect of the Atonement is that *qua nos Deo reconciliamur*, by which we are reconciled to GOD; by which we are won by the love of GOD to fulfil the law of GOD, by which we are brought near to GOD, back to His heart and home. It is the problem of the human personality and the free will again. It requires two to make a reconciliation, as it requires two to make a quarrel. GOD hath indeed taken the initiative. But the response must come from man. And so the Apostle, after stating that GOD hath reconciled us to Himself in CHRIST JESUS, appeals to us, "Be ye reconciled to GOD."[1] When *we* were *enemies* we were reconciled to GOD by the death of His SON,[2] through Whom we have received the reconciliation.[3] This is a real reconciliation, because there was and there is a real want of harmony between Heaven and earth. The outcome of the heart of GOD reconciles us to the demands of holiness, and the love of GOD manifested in the Cross of CHRIST helps us in the daily deposition of "the mind of the flesh, which is enmity against GOD."[4] This explanation is more in accordance with Scripture than the old theory of a necessary appeasement of the wrath of GOD by the sacrifice of His own SON. The obstruction being in us, in our nature, to the holiness of GOD, which required recognition and expression in human life, it had to be removed in us and in our nature. And this was done by One Who took our nature upon Him in its entirety, Who was organically one with us, and Who manifested the love and righteousness of GOD in a human life. So doing, He not only overcame the opposition in man's heart to GOD actually in His own Person and as

[1] καταλλάγητε τῷ θεῷ (2 Cor. v. 21).

[2] Rom. v. 10: "GOD is not ἐχθρός, but we were ἐχθροί." With concluding clause compare "qui per passionem reconciliavit nos Deo" ("Iren.," iii. 16, 9).

[3] Rom. v. 11.

[4] Rom. viii. 7.

the Head of humanity representatively and potentially in all men, but He also showed the possibility of satisfying the highest yearning and impulse in the human heart—its desire for GOD. Wherever mankind is true to itself and does not identify the Voice of GOD that speaks in the inner consciousness, convincing and reproving—"the Deity that is in us,"[1] as Marcus Aurelius expressed it—with the mere beating of the human heart,[2] but rather with the SPIRIT of GOD bearing witness with our spirit, this yearning for reunion with GOD has found expression, as in the Thirty-third and Fifty-first Psalms, and its possibility has been acknowledged in the "Meditations" of the Roman Emperor, who wrote: "GOD has allowed this to no other part after it has been separated and cut asunder to come together again. But consider the goodness with which He has privileged man; for He has put it in his power when he has been separated to return, and to be reunited and to resume his place."

In the first place, it is with the holiness, the perfection of purity and compassion and love of the "righteous FATHER"[3] that the SON would reconcile mankind. "Be ye therefore perfect, as your FATHER in Heaven is perfect."[4] "Be ye therefore merciful, as your FATHER in Heaven is merciful." And the purpose of this reconciliation is, in our LORD'S words, "that the love wherewith Thou lovedst Me may be in them, and I in them"[5]—that is, not that they may share the love, for that is theirs, but that they may realise it and have it indwelling in them, an immanent or abiding principle in their lives, free to take root and develop therein, without the obstructing and thwarting influence of sin and selfishness. To be reconciled to GOD is not, therefore, merely to be reconciled

[1] "Meditations," iii. 5.
[2] Mr. Blatchford in the *Clarion*.
[3] John xvii. 25.
[4] Matt. v. 48; Luke vi. 36.
[5] John xvii. 25, 26.

to His law of holiness, but also to His heart of love. There was a real reconciliation here because there was a real estrangement. Man was won to recognise and imitate the purity and goodness of the FATHER in CHRIST. His love won us to His service, His purity gave us power. The result of this abiding principle is the life of CHRIST in us.[1]

Moreover, He reconciles us with the inscrutable Will of the FATHER in the trials of human existence. Here is a real reconcilement. Many insoluble problems beset our life; but the mystery of the pain and separation, the sorrows and bereavements, is the greatest of all. A perplexed mind is nothing in comparison with a broken heart. And the light that falls upon that dark page of our life from the Cross of CHRIST not only illuminates the scroll with letters of a Heavenly pattern, but reveals words of Divine comfort. "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take My yoke upon you, and learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For My yoke is easy, and My burden is light." Full of paradoxes as human life is, this saying seems full of contradictions. But if we cannot understand the solution of the problem theoretically, we know at any rate that it has been solved practically in a very real, if not scientific, manner by Him Who worked out the mystery of pain and suffering, and brought them to a blessed consummation in His own life. And since we are taught by Him to learn obedience from the things we suffer and to obtain purity of soul from the pains of life and sanctification from its sorrows, we see the human life in CHRIST brought out of its distressing

[1] Col. iii. 3: "For ye died, and your life hath been hid (*κέκρυπται*) with CHRIST in GOD." *Cf.* Gal. ii. 20: "I live, yet no longer I, but CHRIST liveth in me"; John xv. 4: "No more can ye, except ye abide in Me."

dilemmas and bewildering doubts to a peaceful and happy consummation.

Thus there is a real reconciliation with one's own soul. There is perfect peace within. For the inner contention of warring principles has been stilled by the dethroning of the principle of evil. No earthly study, science or philosophy, vocation or ambition, can give this inner peace of mind and soul, which can only be found by sinners in that haven of tranquil waters where the love and service, the pardon and purification of the Master offer welcome and refreshment after the unhappy tossing over a troubled sea. Here is serenity and safety, calm and comfort for the broken and wearied voyagers of life—a true and eternal reconcilement with the Holy Life of their FATHER in Heaven.

Furthermore, the social reconciliation of mankind is the corollary of the reconciliation, and is set forth in the Epistle to the Ephesians:[1] "For He is our peace, Who made both one, and broke down the wall of partition between us, having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, in order to make the twain in Himself into one new man, making peace; and that He might reconcile the twain unto GOD in one body through the Cross, having slain the enmity thereby." The Cross is thus the basis of a double reconciliation of man to GOD and of man to his fellow: "For through Him we both have the approach by one SPIRIT unto the FATHER."[2] In the building up of this mystical body of CHRIST, which is described in this chapter,[3] there is neither distinction of race nor class nor religion. All men are one in CHRIST. He has set man right with His neighbour by the unification of the race in a new and living brotherhood. The Church of CHRIST—the Body of

[1] Eph. ii. 14-19.
[2] Eph. ii. 18: *την προσαγωγήν*.
[3] Eph. ii. 22.

CHRIST—is a perpetual witness to the Fatherhood of GOD and the brotherhood of man. Here, more than anywhere else, there is the possibility of realising the truth of the Roman Emperor's words: "We are made for co-operation, like feet, like hands, like eyelids, like the rows of the upper and lower teeth. To act against one another is contrary to nature; and it *is* acting against one another to be vexed and turn away."[1] For it testifies to the reconsecration of humanity in CHRIST to a higher service, whereby man is enabled to realise the Divine ideal and empowered to become the messenger of GOD to His brother man. The atonement of man with man is based on the Atonement of GOD and man. This is the social aspect of the Gospel: "First be reconciled to thy brother, then come and offer thy gift."[2] For He Who is the redeeming element in the society of men, Who brings out the true man in men, enables them to realise the end of their existence in a Society, founded on His great self-sacrifice and inspired by His Divine Spirit. And in that Divine Society, His Church, His Body, we are taught the organic unity of humanity in CHRIST. In Him all humanity is gathered up by reason of this organic connection. In Him there is, therefore, neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, but all are one in CHRIST,[3] the Elder Brother of the race. He has gathered the Divine family around Himself, restoring each to each and reconciling all to the FATHER, "slaying the enmity"—that is, overcoming the opposition in man's heart to GOD's will and love, by His Cross and Passion,[4] and winning man to co-operate with GOD in His great purpose. After this manner the kingdom of GOD is

[1] "Meditations," ii. 1.

[2] Matt. v. 24.

[3] John xvi. 20, 21: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word; that they all may be one, as Thou, FATHER, art in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us."

[4] Eph. ii. 13-18.

realised upon earth, being a realm of united wills working for one and the same end—the regeneration of the world.

This social aspect of the kingdom frees us from the cramping individualism of the popular gospel. Salvation is not the end of our existence. But service is. We are saved in order to serve. This is the higher standpoint of life. Christians are required to fill up whatever is lacking in the afflictions of CHRIST on behalf of His Church—that is, to carry the Cross, the symbol of their own self-denial as well as the sign of their reconciliation, after Him. So feeling with GOD, so working with GOD, and so following CHRIST, men are on the path to union and on the road to progress.

A reformation of moral and spiritual life does not of necessity involve a revolution of the social order. He Who said, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," would reconcile man with his social environment, the conditions of being ruled and obedient which are essential to the security of social life; whereas the spirit of rebellion against the powers that be, which are ordained of GOD, often provoked by modern socialism, is as often fatal not only to the social life but also to the religious well-being of the community, as the overthrow of the State generally, if not always, ends in the downfall of its religion.

The whole fabric of humanity, the whole machinery of political, social, national and international life and relations of life, can only be brought into oneness with the Divine Will when each individual strives as far as in him lies to bring to bear upon that part of the social order, be it small or great, with which he is connected the moralising forces of Divine love, goodness, and wisdom. It is in this sense that "the glory of the latter house shall be greater than of the former,"[1] and the reconciliation of GOD

[1] Hag. ii. 9.

and man takes on a cosmic aspect. Regenerated man and redeemed creation, the environment of man, shall glorify GOD, "Who filleth all in all," and so all things shall be summed up in CHRIST. Finding in Him their true and only and original Head, they shall reach the full flower of their development in and through Him. Such consummation is reconciliation perfected.[1]

And finally, to His Church, His Body, He has committed the word of reconciliation, the message of pardon to the penitent, and she on her part entrusts to the ordained members of her priesthood the ministry of reconciliation.[2] May we prove faithful to our trust, and never cease to regard it as a responsibility, not only to the Church that has appointed us to her priesthood, but as a responsibility to the CHRIST of the Church, Who has called her forth from the world to be His Bride, Whose Divine Personality is the source of her power, and Whose Spirit of Love is the inspiration of her life.

[1] Eph. i. 10: "To sum up all things in CHRIST, both the things in Heaven and the things on earth" = Col. i. 20: "Through Him to reconcile all things unto Himself . . . things in Heaven and things on earth."

[2] Moberly, "Ministerial Priesthood," p. 259.

CHAPTER X

PRIESTHOOD AND SACRIFICE

At the present time a feeling of irritation, almost of resentment, is caused by the use of the Jewish sacrificial terms in connection with our Lord's life. The Epistle to the Hebrews is a stumbling-block to many who demand that its faded metaphors of priest and sacrifice should be translated into the current terms of modern thought and speech and life. The question is not whether we are to assign more importance to a manual compiled by an unknown Jewish writer,[1] and not universally accepted in the Christian Church, than to our Lord's own teaching, but whether its apparently lifeless shells of Jewish thought do not contain the very realities of our religion. We do not desire to remove the old forms, but to reach the ideas they clothe. The death of the idea, of necessity, involves the abolition of its form; but the idea, if it is living, survives the provisional and temporary form in its turn. If theology is not to be numbered among the dead languages, its ideas must be living and capable of adjusting themselves to the passing forms of thought and modes of expression; otherwise they will be powerless to inspire and control the aspirations of the age. And the very history of the Atonement shows that there was growth and expansion of living thought behind the outward form

[1] Aquila, Barnabas, Apollos, or Luke (at St. Paul's dictation), have been named.

and shell of dogma. It were unreason to dress our persons and robe our thoughts in garments two thousand years old. But the material at our disposal is the same. JESUS CHRIST is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. And His sacrifice and priesthood, when viewed in the light of His Personality, are not archæological curiosities, but living truths. They represent two great realities: GOD in man, conquering sin and bearing sorrow, and man in GOD, confessing sin and offering service. These ideas must be presented in such a way that they will have life and power, as they had in an age when Jewish rites and sacrifices were fresh in the memory of man. The *Zeitgeist* is a force that must be taken into account, as well as the environment. The same ideas must be expressed in different forms, to suit different temperaments and orders of intellect. On the one hand, we are engaged in an attempt to disengage the realities of the Christian faith from their ancient Oriental garb; and on the other, in an endeavour to express these same realities in modern Oriental forms.[1]

The priesthood of CHRIST is the one great idea of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and even if we would not describe that priesthood in the forms of thought employed, we may not abandon the central idea, that CHRIST maintained His own nearness to GOD to bring others near to Him, that both in His life and death He fulfilled with unswerving fidelity and love His vocation and ministry as the Son of Man, and so realised all priestly ideals.

It was this aspect of our LORD'S Personality, which depended on his perfect humanity—for it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren in all things, that He might be a compassionate and faithful High-Priest in relation to GOD[2]—that appealed to Ritschl, who emphasised

[1] Bishop Gore at Edinburgh Missionary Conference, 1910.
[2] Heb. ii. 17, 18.

the fact that CHRIST was a Priest for Himself, in maintaining His own nearness to GOD, before He could be a Priest for others. It was because He was the Priest, Who learned obedience from what He suffered,[1] Who suffered Himself, having been tempted,[2] and was perfected[3] for evermore, that His Priesthood passeth not to another,[4] that He ever liveth to intercede for His people;[5] and it was because He offered Himself without spot, through the eternal SPIRIT, to GOD,[6] that He became the author of *eternal* salvation,[7] the mediator of an *eternal* covenant,[8] and the founder of an *eternal* redemption.[9] His humanity, thus consecrated by suffering and trial,[10] is the new and living way for mankind to GOD,[11] just as it is the secret of His sympathy with, and desire to succour, the suffering and the tempted sons of men.[12]

To the writer of these passages CHRIST is the SON of GOD, the off-raying of His glory, and stamp of His Person,[13] but He is also the High-Priest of humanity, the great Priest over the Household of GOD.[14] Jewish customs and rites assisted the Jewish mind to understand and describe the relation in which this faithful Priest stood to GOD and to man. The high-priest, entering into the Holy of Holies with blood for himself and the people, served as a figure of Him Who entered, through the Eternal SPIRIT, into the most hallowed and perfect communion with the FATHER, and Who leadeth men into the same communion by the same Eternal SPIRIT in which He offered His blood—that is, His human life, His earthly blood, which was a true and living sacrifice to GOD. For His human life had to be purified and liberated or ever it

[1] Heb. v. 8. [2] Heb. ii. 18.
[3] *τελειωθείς* (Heb. v. 9); *cf.* vii. 28: *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον*.
[4] *ἀπαράβατον* (Heb. vii. 24). [5] Heb. vii. 25.
[6] Heb. ix. 14. [7] Heb. v. 9. [8] Heb. xiii. 20.
[9] Heb. ix. 12. [10] Heb. ii. 10. [11] Heb. x. 19.
[12] Heb. ii. 18. [13] Heb. i. 3. [14] Heb. x. 21.

could present itself a living sacrifice to GOD. And the Spirit of the Mediator overcame the separating power of sin and enabled Him to enter into and remain in spiritual communion with the FATHER and to offer up praises and thanksgiving with acceptance, and to present His Body a living sacrifice through the same Eternal SPIRIT.

His qualifications for this High-Priesthood are:

1. The identity of will between the Priest and GOD, which was perfect in CHRIST, in Whom perfect trust and perfect love met together. Though a SON, yet learned He obedience. Obedience was the breath of His life. The FATHER was the central influence of His being; dependence on GOD was, as so frequently described in the Fourth Gospel,[1] the essence of His consciousness, and, paradoxical as it may seem, the presence of the FATHER was the secret of His personality. And although His will was wholly conditioned by another's will, yet by reason of His humanity, with its limitations and temptations and tendency to revolt, He was compelled to exercise a considerable vigilance and self-restraint, so that His obedience was learned and consummated in the things He suffered. And thus He became to man a real revelation of the truth of the Divine Character in its righteousness and its sympathy, its capacity for suffering and its will to save.

Holy, undefiled, and separated from sinners is this High-Priest, because He is perfectly consecrated and united to GOD. His supreme qualification for the High-Priesthood of humanity was this sinlessness. "Which of you convinceth Me of sin?"[2] was His challenge to the world. And the HOLY SPIRIT shall convince the world of sin because they believe not on Him,[3] the Sinless One. For it is by His sinlessness man is judged, reproved, and

[1] John x. 37, 38; John xiv 10, etc.
[2] John viii. 46.
[3] John xvi. 9.

condemned. A sufficient reason for that sinlessness may be His Divine Nature. But we feel sure our LORD Himself would not urge it. His will was free to sin. There was the possibility of His willing otherwise than in accordance with GOD. The explanation of His sinlessness was not that He was not able to sin, but that He was able not to sin.[1] It was as man that He won the victory. Otherwise He were not a High-Priest tempted in all points as we are, able to sympathise, and therefore to succour and save. But having been Himself tempted and tried in the furnace of temptation, knowing what sin is, as we cannot know it, knowing it in its awful nature as separating the life of man from GOD, as thwarting the Divine purpose, as rendering the heart of GOD unhappy and the life of man miserable, He was able to save us from it by awakening in us a horror of sin, a desire for a Saviour, a wish for a new life.

2. Here we have touched upon the second important qualification of the High-Priest of humanity, the identity of His nature with that of those He represented, which is proved by His capacity for suffering and liability to temptation. He, like us, was made perfect by sufferings. He, like us, had to learn obedience in a stern school. He was consecrated as the Captain of our salvation by sufferings.[2] He, like us, was liable to temptation. He, like us, needed to make prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears. And if we do not go with Dr. Du Bose in his statement that "He needed the salvation which our humanity needs," we can understand that the sinlessness of the Son of Man was the outcome of His vigilance, His self-control, His love and His faithfulness to Him that appointed Him;[3] and that He would have been the

[1] "Non posse peccare, posse non peccare."

[2] Heb. ii. 10; ii. 18; iv. 15; v. 7.

[3] ποιήσαντι (iii. 2). Athanasius says this must not be understood as if the Word as Word were made, but rather that the Word was

last to presume upon His Divine origin and powers, the record of His life in the Gospels inclines us to believe.

By reason of this perfect identity with us in our sufferings and trials, our LORD had a perfect knowledge of the failings of our humanity, and a perfect will to set us free from them and to make us whole, because of His perfect sympathy with us in our temptations in the flesh, in our conflict with sin, in our agony of sorrow. Thus, as our High-Priest, in and according to His humanity, He is the Captain of our salvation. He can succour and save humanity because He has been through the fire Himself. And He can represent humanity to GOD because His human life was a real exhibition of the truth of the human character in its love and its devotion to and through death. Such were the supreme qualifications our High-Priest had for His work.

His High-Priestly work in its Godward aspect consists of prayer and offering, and in its manward aspect of absolution and benediction.

In the first place stands prayer.[1] Prayer is the function of every true priest, and the spirit of prayer is love:

> "He prayeth best who loveth best
> All things both great and small."

In the case of our LORD, prayer was perfect, because love was perfect. His life was one long prayer to GOD, because He was ever in holy communion with Him through the Eternal SPIRIT. And He was heard by reason of His godly fear,[2] having learned obedience from what He had

---

made High-Priest, by putting on a body that was made ("Orat.," ii. 8). The Arians considered that His Priesthood preceded His Incarnation, and was a proof of His inferiority. The true doctrine is that He was Priest in and according to His humanity (Athanasius, ii. 246, Newman).

[1] "JESUS is the great High-Priest of One GOD, Who is also FATHER, Who prays for man" (Clement of Alexandria, "Strom.," iv. 93).

[2] εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας (Heb. v. 7).

suffered. It was this perfect communion that gave Him His perfect self-mastery, His sublime majesty. It was the dread of its cessation, the horror of isolation from GOD, that wrung from Him in the isolating moment of death the cry of dereliction, though it was more the dread of such separation than its possibility that creates the pathos of that cry. This prayerfulness of His Spirit is but another aspect of His Divine character, which expressed itself in active and suffering obedience. It was the utterance of His union with His FATHER, of His conscious identity of Himself with the FATHER.

His prayer was also intercessory.[1] By reason of His perfect humanity His intercession is perfect.[2] He prayed as one whose heart was touched by our infirmities and sympathised with our weaknesses. The Epistle to the Hebrews emphasises this point. "Father, forgive them," was His prayer on the Cross for His enemies. He showed active sympathy with us in thought and deed, just as He manifested the identity of His will with the will of His FATHER. As His life, in one sense, was a perfect exhibition of the character of GOD under human conditions, in another sense it was a presentation of an unbroken, unfaltering obedience that was consummated in death. In the seventeenth chapter of St. John we have the intercessory prayer of the High-Priest of humanity, a prayer of Atonement—"that they may be one, as we are one, I in them and Thou in Me."[3] In the same Gospel He speaks of His own intercession: "I will pray the FATHER, and He will give you another Comforter."[4] Prayer being also expiatory in the sense that it averts an evil influence from the soul, frees the mind from baser thoughts, and purifies

[1] *Cf.* Rom. viii. 34: "Who also maketh intercession (ἐντυγχάνει) for us." *Cf.* Heb. ix. 25: "Seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them."

[2] Heb. iv. 15. [3] John v. 22. [4] John xiv. 16.

the spirit, this most sublime prayer of all[1] averted the evil influence from the work of the Atonement, which was consummated in that spiritual union of the FATHER and the SON which issued in the spiritual communion of man with GOD and of GOD with man, which was made possible by the Spirit of the FATHER which is in the SON, and the Spirit of the SON which is in His people—the Spirit of love.

In the same manner the SPIRIT He has sent "maketh intercession for us with unutterable groanings."[2] His life was one long prayer for the race with which He had so closely identified Himself. And as He lifted up His soul in prayer to the FATHER for His enemies who watched His dying agonies, interceding for their ignorance and iniquity; so the great Priest over the Household or Family of GOD,[3] our Intercessor in Heaven, into which He has passed to consummate the work of His Cross and Passion, intercedes for us, whose sins and shortcomings cause greater sorrow to the Bleeding Heart than the cruelty and hatred of His earthly antagonists, and whose various needs and wants He desires to satisfy.[4] There the meaning of fellowship of GOD and man is realised and the High-Priesthood of CHRIST finds its consummation. He is still the High-Priest of humanity, the sanctifying Head until "the ages,"[5] the one Mediator between GOD and man.

There are people, like the members of the Roman Community, who do not think themselves good enough to approach our LORD directly, but invoke the intercession of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints with Him; and others, like Ritschl, who consider Him too remote and aloof for access. The writer to the Hebrews seems to

[1] John xvii. [2] Rom. viii. 26. [3] Heb. x. 21.
[4] *εἰς εὔκαιρον βοήθειαν*, "for a timely succour" (Heb. iv. 16).
[5] Heb. xiii. 8.

have anticipated such an attitude; for he is most careful to point out that it is because of His own sufferings, because He learned obedience from the things He suffered, because He suffered Himself being tempted, that He is a merciful and faithful High-Priest, and is able to give succour to them who are being tempted. Accordingly, we duly pray in the Litany that it may please Him to succour, help, and comfort all that are in danger, necessity, and tribulation. For we are sure that He will hasten to our assistance in the hour of trial and distress because of His great sympathy, which springs from the complete knowledge of, and self-identification with, our nature and condition of life.[1] And because He Himself knew what it was to pray to the FATHER in the days of His flesh, when He offered up "prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him Who was able to save Him from death, and was heard in that He feared,"[2] He is willing, and more than willing, to hear and receive the supplications of His people, and to listen to the cry of the soul in peril. Our access to Him is based upon His perfect understanding of, and His complete identification with, our humanity and its temptations, as His own access to the FATHER is based not less upon His obedience and godly fear than upon His eternal Sonship.

Furthermore, offering or sacrifice is an essential part of the work of the priest. A sacrifice St. Augustine defined as any work done to unite ourselves in holy fellowship with GOD.[3] Our High-Priest had also an offering.[4] He offered a sinless life for sinful humanity; He offered[5] Him-

[1] Even the early Romans believed this of their divinities—*e.g.*, In tam præcipiti tempore ferret opem" (Ovid, "Fast.," i. 402).

[2] Heb. v. 7. [3] "De Civ.," x. 6.

[4] Sacrificium=a holy thing, or a thing made holy or consecrated, *θυσία* (LXX, Gen. iv. 3, 5). *Cf.* Cain's offering—a bloodless one; also in Mal. i. 11: a pure offering, and always of the *minkhah*, or meat-offering, which was of bread; also a "living sacrifice" (Rom. xii. 1).

[5] 1 Pet. ii. 23.

self a living sacrifice to GOD, transforming by His devotion and love, obedience and death, the life of humanity into what a Jew of the first century might now describe as a sweet-smelling incense offering to GOD,[1] and anon, more fitly, as a sanctuary of GOD, a home of prayer, a temple of praise and adoration.[2]

The blood in this Epistle, as in 1 John, stands for the life of CHRIST and its purifying power. It was the evidence of a life laid down for man; it was the sacrament of a life given to man. In one sense that offering was voluntary[3] and intelligent and effectual, in contrast with the sacrifices of the Old Testament, that were not. But in another sense the "blood" was a symbol of a death of violence and shame, of the High-Priest of humanity made the victim of its sin, the bearer of its sorrow, as all the forces of evil conspired against Him, as the misrepresentatives of the humanity He would save and complete, represent and exalt, removed Him by force. Such phrases as "washed us from our sins,"[4] "have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb,"[5] symbolise the process of the atoning grace of that life given to man through sorrow and suffering and death, cleansing the conscience, purifying the soul, and sustaining the spirit in its weakness and want.

Our High-Priest, our Sacred Head, offered Himself to GOD. He presented His own obedience, His own devotion, His own sufferings, His own penitence, His own life, all consummated by His death, to His FATHER—the perfect sacrifice of humanity which humanity could not offer. He also presented Himself to His people under the form of bread

[1] 2 Cor. ii. 15: "We are a sweet savour (*εὐωδία*) of CHRIST to GOD"; Eph. v. 2: "An offering to GOD for a sweet-smelling savour" (*εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας*).

[2] *ναὸς Θεοῦ* (1 Cor. iii. 16); *cf.* vi. 19.

[3] *αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν* (1 Pet. ii. 24).

[4] Rev. i. 5, or loosed (*λύσαντι*).

[5] Rev. vii. 14.

and wine—symbols of the body and blood offered and shed for man, both in anticipation of the consummation of the sacrifice of self He had continually offered to His FATHER, and also in token that those who accepted His headship thus offered were veritable members of His Body—over which death hath no more dominion—a consecrated humanity, a royal priesthood, a living Church.

The efficacy and value of that sacrifice lay in its moral intrinsic worth. The writer of the Epistle is well aware of our LORD'S pre-existent glory—which is set forth in the first chapter, the prologue of the Epistle[1]—but he saw that the virtue of His sacrifice lay in the offering of an obedient will. And so he does not treat the Divinity of our LORD as imparting an infinite value to His sufferings and sacrifice, but rather as proof of His own worthiness to be our Redeemer and of the transcendent greatness of His love and condescension. "Lo, I come to do Thy will, O GOD."[2] Here was a new type of sacrifice, which infinitely transcended, and consequently superseded, the old—the offering of an obedient will in a human nature—the body, which is the only vehicle in which the human spirit can manifest its goodness, its devotion and its love, the only medium available in which these inward qualities can be realised, and in which they must be realised if they are there at all. The perfect sacrifice of CHRIST was not, then, wholly inward,[3] for it necessarily involved an outward manifestation in and through the medium at His disposal, and in the most trying circumstances. He offered His body a living sacrifice, as we are enjoined to do.[4] His sacrifice was self-chosen, self-determined. He

[1] *Cf.* the Prologue of St. John. [2] Heb. x. 9.

[3] Scott Holland, "Priesthood and Sacrifice," p. 85: "It has been said that CHRIST'S perfect sacrifice is wholly inward, of the heart. But is it not essential to sacrifice that it should be the outward act by which the inward intention is realised, is pledged, is sealed?"

[4] Rom. xii. 1.

voluntarily laid down His life that He might take it again. For such was the FATHER'S will.[1]

By that will, which moved in unison with the FATHER'S will, and which gave expression to its love in a life of self-sacrifice that culminated in death, we are sanctified.[2] This is why the same writer speaks of the blood by which one is sanctified, and which signifies the process of mental pain and sorrow and moral humiliation through which that will passed in order to bring men nearer to GOD. His offering was more than a homage to righteousness; it was its vindication, and therefore an atonement. The principle of righteousness was asserted in our humanity by Him Who condemned sin in the flesh. As Son of Man our LORD offered both a perfect obedience to GOD'S will and a perfect penitence for man's sin—a thing made impossible for man by his very sin. By reason of His spiritual union with the FATHER, He offered to GOD a holy hatred of sin, and by reason of His organic unity with humanity, He offered to GOD a heart-felt sorrow for the sin of that humanity, a sorrow which man should, but cannot, adequately feel, because sin has made it impossible by deadening his feelings—for in this sense also the wages of sin is death. The sinner, corrupted and enthralled by sin, cannot condemn, or hate, or feel its bitterness and shame as He did Who loved GOD with a holy love and hated sin with a holy hatred. By reason of the human nature He had made His own, He felt the alienation and despair of sin, the agony and bitterness it causes in the soul of man, all the more keenly because sin had not marked Him for its own. And all alone in His human consciousness He bore its burthen and He felt its curse—as a thing that had perverted the will of

[1] John x. 18.

[2] Heb. x. 10, "by which will we are sanctified." *Cf.* x. 29, "the blood of the covenant by which He was sanctified"—*i.e.*, the self-sacrificing manifestation of that will.

man and turned his light into darkness, but as a thing alien from Himself, a thing that was no part of His personality as it is of ours; a thing, however, that was to be conquered in humanity and cast out of humanity. This spiritual isolation, the Cross He bore all through His life, reached its climax on the Cross that bore Him in His death. His perfect penitence for the sin of man and His own perfect obedience to the will of GOD was the sacrifice our High-Priest offered to the FATHER.

But in no sense did He endure the penalty or accept the curse in our stead. Not for Him the pangs of a guilty conscience; not for Him æonian alienation from the presence of the FATHER. But He entered so voluntarily and so fully into the conditions of the life He had come to redeem that it forced Him to taste in its bitterness the cup of death which was due to sin for everyone, as though He Himself were the author of the evil from which He came to save mankind. In Gethsemane He prayed that that cup might be removed from Him. On the Cross He tasted it. As the SON of GOD He had already known and borne the sins of mankind in His Divine consciousness. For Divine love is the highest form of love, and therefore the highest form of self-sacrifice and sympathy. But as the Son of Man He now experiences the hopelessness and the bitterness of the racial conflict with evil; while realising, as only a Divine Being could, what it is to bear on His Heart the concentrated agony of æons of men. And on the Cross He revealed for a brief moment the sympathy and sorrow of GOD, suffering for and in the humanity He would save. And He offered the sacrifice of a blameless life (in His case eucharistic) to GOD, which we could not offer. This was the vicarious work of our High-Priest.

The Jewish writers of the New Testament, accustomed to the ritual of sacrifice, contemplated His life as a sacrifice that might be classified among their temple

offerings, albeit their crown and consummation, and accordingly invested His death with sacrificial emblems and implements and accessories, suggestive of execution and suffering and shame. This led St. Paul to the extreme expression of Gal. iii. 13: "CHRIST hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a *curse* for us, for it is written: Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." Our Divine High-Priest freed us from the curse and blight of sin by exhausting its bitterness in becoming a curse, not in the sight of GOD, but in the sight of man, by dying on a cross, then an accursed tree, but now the symbol of a perfected sacrifice. What, we ask, would be the force of this argument had our LORD been executed with the sword? His life had been crowned by a death no less inspiring, no less Divine, involving indeed less physical suffering and humiliation, but equally effectual in showing an obedience unto death and a love greater than death, and with results for humanity equally stupendous and eternal. The Crucifixion itself served to give point to the Pauline antitheses and the analogies of the Epistle to the Hebrews—*e.g.*, "outside the gate"[1]—but it was neither the mode nor the scene of that death, but the manner in which it was voluntarily accepted, and the spirit in which it was borne, and the nature of Him Who suffered, that gave it its power over the hearts and souls of men. The triumph[2] of His Death was the victory of self-sacrifice. No one but a Divine Being could show such a perfect self-abnegation, so holy a love, so complete an obedience. No other could offer a like sacrifice; no other could gain so signal a

[1] Heb. xiii. 12.

[2] So St. John represents His death as a triumph. "And I, if I be lifted up, shall draw all men unto Myself"; "Now is the Son of Man glorified"; "FATHER, glorify Thy SON." There was δόξα, not αἰσχύνη, in the Cross for John, who omits all harrowing details, but indicates His perfect humanity in the words, "I thirst."

victory over the elements of sin and selfishness, death and evil; no other could have transformed the nature of man but the SON of GOD Incarnate, *patiens et victor sua patientia;* Who died to self, that man might live for GOD. No other could alter the relations between Heaven and earth, GOD and man, save Him Who, by His High-Priesthood, consecrated a new and living way of approach to the FATHER'S Home and Life; and "purchased a Church with His own blood,"[1] that is, inaugurated a new kingdom of love and duty in the world by His life and death of self-sacrifice, and having convicted by His righteous love and His loving righteousness the unhallowed principles of hatred and evil, selfishness and rebellion, returned to share His FATHER'S glory, after the accomplishment of His Mission; and shall come again to judge both the living and the dead.

Our High-Priest, then, offered Himself on the altar. "For we have an altar."[2] But this was not the Cross, which was the instrument of death, for the Jews never slew their victims on the altar, and therefore the Cross could not be the "altar which sanctifieth the gift." And yet this is the opinion of many who follow the interpretation of St. Thomas Aquinas. Neither is it the LORD'S Table, for our LORD did not offer Himself there once for all.[3] The altar was the self-sacrifice and obedience and love on which the SON of GOD renounced His Divine power and authority, in order that He might sanctify the people by His human life that passed through death to save mankind.[4] CHRIST, then, in His Incarnate life and love is the Altar of which we may eat and live for ever.[5] That Altar is the means of our Atonement and Communion; it is the vehicle of a new life, the channel of new graces, for the

[1] Acts xx. 28. [2] Heb. xiii. 10.

[3] This interpretation, however, has many adherents, among them Rev. Leighton Pullan. See "The Atonement," p. 244.

[4] Heb. xiii. 12. [5] John vi. 51, 54 *et seq.*

High-Priest hath an "unchanging priesthood" and He is "JESUS the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever."[1] The High-Priest of humanity, the Head of the race, offered Himself on the Altar of His obedience, as He ever offers Himself, not to win the FATHER'S favour, but that we might participate in His sacrifice. It was in His human body that the Word offered Himself, His human life, and became the Author of our salvation.

But the Scriptures would remind us that the Godhead was not concealed in the sufferings and moment of His death. "Truly this man was (the) SON of GOD," exclaimed the Roman centurion.[2] And St. Matthew[3] records an earthquake and other alarming happenings in Nature, while he and St. Mark and St. Luke mention a preternatural darkness. It seemed as if the Creation sympathised with the agony of the Creator. But again it is to be noted that these lurid accompaniments of His death, while serving to impress the minds of the observers with the solemnity and awe of the scene they have witnessed, do not of necessity affect the great occurrence. They could be omitted without loss, as they are by St. John, who records a higher expression of his LORD'S Divinity than the other Evangelists.[4] The fact to be realised is that the SON of GOD, emptied of His glory, endured unspeakable anguish for us, redeemed our lives by His life, suffered, not that we might not suffer, but that we might suffer with Him, and was glorified that we might be glorified with Him. "For if we died with Him, we shall also live with Him; if we endure, we shall also reign with Him."[5]

The offering of our High-Priest was more than a martyrdom; it was a "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice,

[1] Heb. xiii. 8. [2] Mark xv. 40. [3] Matt. xxvii. 51.
[4] "My Lord and my God" (John xx. 28).
[5] 2 Tim. ii. 11.

oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world," for "He is the propitiation for our sins."[1]

The work of CHRIST had some mysterious power over and regarding sin. The averting of the wrath of GOD, the payment of the death penalty, however, is hardly consistent with the passage: "In this matter is love, not that we loved GOD, but that He loved us and sent His SON to be the propitiation for our sins";[2] in which the SON is sent by the FATHER in His great love for us, not in His stern exaction of the forfeiture. The writer to the Hebrews used a remarkably picturesque word, which throws light on the taking away of sin in his powerful summary of the Atonement: "But now once in the consummation of the ages hath He appeared to put away sin[3] by the sacrifice of Himself"—that is, to disannul sin, to set it aside as a superseded law, or a broken treaty, or a revoked promise, to mark it with the sign of condemnation as wrong and interpolated. And truly sin was put away, marked false with the ὀβελός of the Cross, and proved to be a spurious element in the life of man, and therefore to be erased.

It is also this removal[4] of the offence, the hindrance to the life of holiness, that the Apostle St. John contemplates, as he dwells on the work of "the Lamb Who taketh away the sin of the world."[5] And this is effected by the High-Priest as He pronounces His absolution and forgiveness of sins upon those who approach Him in humility and penitence, making full confession of their sins, like the publican in His own parable, who said: "LORD, be merciful to me[6] the sinner." It is in this sense that He is said[7] to forgive or remove the sins of the people, for it is by so doing that He proves Himself a *compassionate* and *faithful* High-

[1] See Lecture III. [2] 1 John iv. 10.
[3] εἰς ἀθέτησιν (Heb. ix. 10). *Cf.* vii. 18, ἀθέτησις of the disannulling of the commandment.
[4] ἀθέτησις. [5] John i. 29. [6] Ἱλάσθητί μοι.
[7] ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτιάς τοῦ λαοῦ.

Priest in Divine matters.[1] These epithets, especially *compassionate*, could not apply to the action of winning the favour of GOD, but would express appropriately His action in pardoning—for pity pardons—our offences. While the epithet *faithful* is connected in 1 John i. 9 with forgiveness, GOD is faithful to forgive.[2] "If we confess our sins, He is *faithful* and *just*, so that He forgives us our sins and cleanses us from all unrighteousness." That is, if we fulfil the conditions of obtaining pardon, we may rely upon the faithfulness and justice of GOD to give us that pardon. In manifesting His righteousness in CHRIST, through Whom we have forgiveness of sins, GOD justified Himself in the eyes of men, as He justifies in His own eyes those who live in the faith of JESUS.[3] We must connect the righteousness of GOD with the pardon He gives us rather than with the price supposed to have been paid for that pardon, for the resources of GOD'S love fulfilled the requirements of His law.

This pardon differs from human forgiveness. Man sets limits to his forgiveness; GOD sets none of either quality or quantity. Men forgive offences on condition that they are not repeated. GOD forgives in order to prevent them being repeated, in order to strengthen and restore, in order to give peace, power, and purity. This is an aspect of the absolution of the High-Priest, a part of His work as propitiation, for He has *covered over* (atoned for) our deficiency with His sufficiency, and justified the ways of GOD to man by reasserting the Divine life among men, and by filling up the measure of love and duty that man owed GOD.

[1] Heb. ii. 17.

[2] δίκαιος ἵνα. Here ἵνα, usually understood of purpose, seems to suggest a consequence, like Latin *ut*. It is the conjunction affected by St. John, and used with considerable latitude. *Cf.* John xv. 8, where it is epexegetical, not final.

[3] Rom. iii. 25.

And if this is true of His life, it is much more true of His death. There was a tremendous significance in the death of such a Divine Being. His life—at least since His mission commenced—was lived under the shadow of His death, and was a veritable Via Dolorosa. "I have a Baptism to be baptized with," He said, "and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!" For a holy person to undergo that which is generally, whether rightly or wrongly, connected with sin; for a Divine person to encounter that which is ever associated with defeat; for One Who was above us, as well as of us, to make Himself freely and voluntarily responsible for the collective organic sin of the race, in order that He might manifest the holy and righteous character of GOD and His tender and loving heart, that He might re-create the collective organic conscience of the race, meant a supreme strain and agony of soul.

And yet the necessity of this Atonement was twofold. There was the Divine necessity and the human, the judicial and the moral. The holy love of the FATHER required that the relations between Himself and His child, broken by sin, should be restored. The righteous law of the FATHER—that universal system of holiness and truth to which, in His self-consistency, GOD is ever true—required that sin, the offence, should be removed, and that which caused it, lust and hate, abolished. The grace of the FATHER, that spontaneous compassion, that free favour, which the nature of GOD can never deny, gave His Only Begotten, and the Word became flesh and tabernacled among us, full of *grace* and truth,[1] so that GOD and man might be reconciled in the one Mediator between GOD and man. Accordingly, "where sin abounded, grace did abound more exceedingly; that as sin reigned in death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, through JESUS CHRIST our LORD."[2]

[1] John i. 14. [2] Rom. v. 20, 21.

There was a human necessity for this Atonement. Men had to learn the relation in which GOD stood to them and to sin before they could repent and be saved; before they could become conscious of sin as GOD feels towards it, and of the separation it has made between man and GOD, and of the bitterness it entails, the hostility it breeds. Our High-Priest gave this instruction with such a demonstration of the holy love and the righteous law of the FATHER that subdues the heart to a repentance *toward* GOD, which enables us to receive the Divine pardon. It was the irresistible appeal of GOD in CHRIST to man to be sorry, and to be better, and it was an *irrefutable* proof that man in CHRIST can rise to higher, diviner things.

Such propitiation was not an absolution from duty, but from sin. GOD'S love was not restored to us merely, for it had never been lost; but it had been turned with all its force upon the hatred and animosity in the soul of man, and vanquished it. And the action of a Divine life upon the diseased springs of human life led to renewal of moral strength and health; while the spirit of obedience manifested by the SON of GOD was not only example but inspiration to live a better life. The knowledge of this work not only relieves, but enables, because it makes a supreme demand upon our moral and spiritual nature, tests our gratitude, puts our honour to the proof, and penetrates our heart.

And in this way our High-Priest, Who has passed into the heavens to consummate His work, and to make perfect the conditions of our fellowship with GOD, pronounces upon His people the Benediction of His peace and love. The iron entered into His soul for the healing of the nations. By His stripes we were healed.[1] He carried the curse of discipline, toil, and suffering in His body, that we might bear it. But His bearing it faithfully and volun-

[1] 1 Pet. ii. 24.

tarily and in pity for us transformed it into a blessing. And men find it a blessing if they learn of Him and bear His yoke, Who lightens every dark and cruel burden by His love and liberty. For He identified Himself so completely with the race He would save that whosoever identifies himself with His cause, holiness, and purity, shall find a more perfect and real life.[1]

Thus our High-Priest consecrated our humanity in all its forms afresh to the service of the living GOD.[2] To its infancy He gave a new significance by His act of blessing the babes, as He gave a new power to His band of followers whom He blessed with uplifted hands, and from whom He was parted in the very act of benediction. Our High-Priest prays for us; intercedes for us; offers Himself to our love, and His sinless life for our example and aspirations; absolves us from our sins, sanctifies us,[3] and gives us His benediction. And through Him—the new and living way[4]—we all have access by one Spirit unto the FATHER.

[1] John iii. 18. [2] Heb. xiii. 12.

[3] Threefold effect of the sacrifice of CHRIST upon us in Hebrews—(1) to purge conscience, καθαρίζειν = forgive; (2) to sanctify, ἁγιάζειν (x. 10); also consecrate (xiii. 12); *cf.* "For their sake I sanctify Myself, that they may be sanctified in truth" (John xvii. 19); (3) to make perfect, bring to an ideal end, τελειοῦν (x. 1). Through CHRIST we are forgiven, consecrated to GOD, and put in a way of realising the ideal end of our existence: worship and praise.

[4] Heb. x. 20.

CHAPTER XI

THE LAMB OF GOD

THE Jewish types of lamb and priest combine to present a complete idea of our LORD'S mediation. Each type supplements and corresponds to the other. As Lamb we see the GOD in man reconciling humanity unto GOD; as Priest we see the man in GOD presenting man to GOD. In other words, as Lamb He represents the manward or descending aspect of His mediation by revealing the pathos and love of GOD in a manner that must touch and win our heart; and as Priest He represents the Godward or ascending aspect of that mediation, acting as our representative, intercessor, and guide to GOD.

Our LORD did not in word identify Himself with either type, but in work and character He was the antitype of both, "The Lamb of GOD, Who taketh away the sin of the world,"[1] a great Priest over the Household of GOD.[2] The words of the great Forerunner present a picture of patient submission and self-sacrifice. The Lamb[3] expresses the

[1] John i. 30.

[2] Heb. x. 20; *cf.* ii. 17, "A compassionate and faithful high-priest in things pertaining to GOD."

[3] Lambs were offered at daily sacrifices, and slain and eaten at Passover. In St. John's Gospel the hour of His death synchronised with the hour of the sacrifice of the lambs in the temple, "between the evenings." *Cf.* quotation, "A bone of Him shall not be broken" (John xix. 36); reference to Paschal lamb (Exod. xii. 46); "CHRIST our Passover is sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. v. 7). Jeremiah (xi. 19) calls himself "a gentle lamb (*kebes*) led to the slaughter." *Cf.* Isa. liii. 7 (*seh*).

innocence, gentleness, suffering, and death of the Son of Man, while the priest represents the intercession of the risen, ascended, and glorified CHRIST.

The sight of suffering appealed to the Jew.[1] The Servant of Jahveh is described in the song of prophecy[2] as a lamb led to the slaughter, a silent victim, a consecrated offering, pouring out his life unto death and bearing the sin of many. So that patient, lonely figure, with the deepening shadow of gathering sorrow upon His life, might well seem to the sympathetic soul of the Baptist to be the Lamb of GOD'S providing.[3] To Himself, JESUS was "the Son of Man, Who came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." The type of His life in the Old Testament was the suffering Servant, for He, too, must suffer.

The Lamb was the focus of several converging lines of thought in the Jewish sacred writings. It was the central hope of the Baptist, the central figure[4] of the Apocalypse, and the central doctrine of St. Peter's creed.[5] But chiefly was it the central conception of the Fourth Gospel, in which the hour of His death coincided with the sacrifice of the Paschal lambs, "between the evenings," and He is represented as the Paschal Lamb of whom a bone shall not be broken.[6] JESUS the Lamb of GOD combines in Himself the two conceptions of sinlessness and suffering. The sinlessness of JESUS may be denied by present-day humanitarians. But it was believed by the Baptist and the writer of the Gospel, who records the challenge,

[1] "Suffering is more apt than sacrifice to win GOD'S favour and to atone for man" (Talmud, "Bereshith Rabba," 5*a*).

[2] Isa. liii. 7. *Asham* (guilt-offering) implies compensation in the original, but cannot be taken in that sense here.

[3] Gen. xx. 8. *Cf.* John iv. 16.

[4] A different word, ἀρνίον, is used in the Apocalypse twenty-seven times, and also in John xxi. 15; nowhere else in the New Testament.

[5] 1 Pet. 18 *et seq.*: "Redeemed with precious blood as of a lamb," etc.

[6] John xix. 36.

"Which of you convinceth Me of sin?" It did not originate with St. Paul.[1] And again, as we think of His moral and mental suffering, we can truly say the Cross of CHRIST is more to us than all His miracles.

Suffering is the mystery of life—as great a mystery as the sin connected with that mystery, for if sin were removed, the suffering of humanity were considerably mitigated. Had sin never been, there had been sorrow, but not such sorrow as we now experience. The message from the Cross to the suffering and the sorrowing is this—

"Is there any sorrow like unto My sorrow?"

He was "the man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." His life was lived perpetually under the shadow of the Cross. The knowledge of His mission, the consciousness of His work, began to oppress Him from His earliest days and saddened His youth. The sense of death became overpowering as the event drew nigh. With His departure ever before His mind, He lived and worked for GOD. Suffering was the rule and rôle of His career. He must suffer.[2] That was the Cross that was laid upon His soul, that was the goal of His human existence, the result of His endeavours, the climax of His agony for man, the cup His FATHER had given Him to drink, the baptism with which He must be baptized.

Although His aspect is believed by some to have been devoid of comeliness, there must have been an indefinable, unapproachable air of sadness about

"... that face,
How beautiful, if sorrow had not made
Sorrow more beautiful than beauty's self!"

---

[1] Holtzmann ("Leben Jesu," p. 36) thinks it did. Wernle, Schmiedel, Bossuet, Foster, R. J. Campbell, etc., deny His perfection ("Jesus or Christ?" p. 191).

[2] δεῖ παθεῖν.

It was the face of One Whose presence revealed the squalor of sin and the majesty of goodness.

CHRIST has taught us to suffer and be strong, and under the shadow of His Cross the will to suffer is endowed with a life no tyranny can still. Sorrow and suffering often fall on the innocent. The suffering of the Son of Man was itself a theodicy, a vindication of the justice of Providence in the matter of the unequal distribution of sorrow and trouble. The problem of the Psalmist is solved on Calvary. There was perfect innocence and perfect suffering too. The love of the Lamb is the explanation of His sorrow. For love is ever united with sorrow by a law which is at once natural and spiritual. The deeper the love, the greater the suffering. In His case the love was eternal and the sorrow infinite. The union of such love and sorrow on such a cosmic scale wrought out the redemption of the race, just as the union of love and sorrow, manifested on a smaller scale by patriots and mothers, effects the redemption of nations, families, and individuals. He was bearing the responsibility of sin and its consequences in humanity, of which responsibility He makes His people partakers. It is not so much that we have suffered, and He has entered into our sufferings, but rather that He has suffered and we have entered into His sufferings. In Himself He was the sinless sufferer; in His relation to us He is the sin-bearer, the Lamb Who took away the principle of sin[1] from human life.

In what sense would a Jew like the Baptist speak of Him as bearing our sin? In the same sense in which the living goat did bear[2] upon him the iniquity of the people into a desert land.[3] It was thus—so a Jew would have understood it—that He bore away our common

[1] Sin is singular, and therefore generic, in Isa. ii. and St. John.
[2] *Nasa.*
[3] Lev. xvi. 22.

corruption, our sin, by removing the defilement that excluded us from the life of GOD. It is customary to quote in this connection St. Matt. viii. 17, "Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses."[1] The meaning has been well expressed by one who translated it, "He removed by bearing." There is a similarity between His bearing of our griefs and His bearing of our sins. For in His human nature CHRIST was amenable to the infirmities of the body and accessible to the suggestions of evil. But as He controlled "the progress of disease" in the case of the afflicted, so He conquered the principle of evil in Himself. The subject of sickness and sin, He proved the master of both, because He removed both. He bore our sins, not by enduring the penalty of sin, for that, as has been proved, was impossible in the case of One Who was never troubled by an evil conscience and never pierced by a pang of remorse, but because He felt the hatefulness and loneliness of sin, because He experienced it in its true nature as rebellion against a loving FATHER'S holy law, because He was touched to the quick by the sadness and misery and degradation it wrought in the lives of men, and He was ever oppressed and thwarted by the contradiction of sinners. And He bore it away, by equipping our degenerate nature with a new power that could conquer it.

This explanation throws light on the passage, "He made Him sin Who knew not sin." In what sense was He made sin? Not in the sense that He was made sinful, as if GOD should say: "Be Thou sin and bear its punishment." For neither guilt nor its punishment, if the correct moral significance of either be maintained, can be transferred. But in the sense that He, the Representative of the FATHER'S holiness and love, and also the Represen-

[1] The Greek words are different: αἴρει, St. John (*ferens abstulit*, Cocceius); ἔλαβε, St. Matthew.

tative of the humanity with which He had physically and representatively united Himself, took the burden of the struggle with evil upon His own soul on our behalf, being qualified to do this because He knew not sin, because He had never felt its weakening taint. GOD was in CHRIST all the time reconciling the world unto Himself,[1] equipping the humanity the SON had taken upon Him with a recuperative power and a new life of the SPIRIT. One Man, by reason of His organic union with the race, by reason of His relation to the race—not by any external transfer of guilt or punishment—bore the suffering and the grief that fell to His share, and endured all that the hatred and sinfulness of man could devise, as part of the experience He had entered upon when He took our nature upon Him. In His death the sinless, loving Son of Man submitted to the worst that the sin and hostility of humanity could invent in its attempt to destroy the just and the righteous, the appearance of which was a constant reproof to itself. It was, by reason of His relation to us, an endurance of the consequences of man's sin, which had engendered such a bitter spirit in humanity, such a hostile condition of soul—a condition over which the wrath of GOD hung like a cloud in the sky, and which was in itself the punishment of sin. So we may say He permitted the consequences of man's opposition to the Divine order He represented to fall upon Himself in the form of persecution and death, and bowing to that order He manifested the righteousness of GOD, which had not been properly vindicated owing to GOD's forbearance in the past to the sins of humanity,[2] absorbing its separation in His reconciliation, its sin in His righteousness, its disobedience in His obedience.

It is true that He bore our sin in His life, but more

[1] 2 Cor. v. 19, 20.
[2] Rom. iii. 26, "in the forbearance of God," ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ.

emphatically in His death. It was of His death that the Baptist prophesied, for the lamb made the sacrifice in its death. It was to His death chiefly that JESUS read references in the historical deliverances and prophetical utterances of the Jews.[1] It was the blood of the Passover lamb that was the sign of the destroying angel. It was the death of their Master that had a peculiar attraction for His disciples. With extraordinary fulness and distinctness they described His death, as if it were the most important event in His life. The words from the Cross are among His most studied and best-prized sayings; imaginary relics of the wood of the Cross itself are counted among the most precious treasures of the world. It was the Lamb *standing as it had been slain*—that is, with the marks of His death upon Him—that St. John saw in the midst of the throne.[2] It was this aspect of CHRIST that appealed with special force to the Jews, who were familiar with the sacrifices of the temple, and for whom the sacrifice of a life must have been the most impressive and central act of worship, however repulsive it be to the Western mind.

The essential work of the Incarnate Word on which our faith is fixed is His death. That overshadows all else that is written of Him. In John xii. 23-31, JESUS Himself attaches a tremendous significance to His death and passion. He was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world[3]—our Eternal Atonement. It is to His death, therefore, that Christians of every age have looked, and still look, and shall ever look, for salvation. It seemed as if the release of the SAVIOUR'S soul from His body was the earnest of both redemption and resurrection for man. Before the close of the first century Clement of Rome wrote: "Let us look to the blood of CHRIST and see how precious it is to our GOD and

[1] Isa. liii. 11. [2] Rev. v. 6. [3] Rev. xiii. 8.

FATHER—the blood which, poured out for our salvation, *recovered for the world the grace of repentance*," words which Bishop Bull fitly declared should be carved in gold. After the dawn of the second century Ignatius of Antioch, on his journey to Rome and martyrdom, wrote to the Church at Tralles: "To the elect and worthy of GOD, and as having peace in body and soul by the passion of JESUS CHRIST, Who died on account of us, that believing in His death ye might escape death."

As there are, according to Bishop Westcott, two distinct ideas included in the sacrifice of a victim—the death of the victim by the shedding of its blood, and the liberation, so to speak, of the principle of life by which it had been animated—so this life became available for another end. The Blood of CHRIST not only signifies His self-sacrifice to GOD for men, but also His reunion with GOD for men; not only His life given for men, but His life given to men.[1]

How that death was effectual Bishop Butler[2] says Scripture has not explained. The mysterious efficacy of CHRIST'S death will always be the process of a mystery to man, even as His Personality is. But the latter is the explanation of the former, as Athanasius has shown. The indwelling Logos[3] imparted its efficacy to His sacrifice. It is described by St. Paul as the Atonement,[4]

[1] See "Epistle of St. John," notes, pp. 34-36.

[2] Angus, "Analogy," ii., c. v., p. 222.

[3] "De Incarn." 9: "The Logos took unto Himself the body capable of death, in order that this Body, by virtue of its conjunction with the all-controlling Logos, might obtain a value which made its death a death for all, and at the same time might retain its incorruptibility through death."

[4] Rom. v. 11: "By Whom we have received the Atonement." *τὴν καταλλαγήν* rendered "reconciliation" in Rom. xi. 15; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19; 2 Macc. v. 20. In 1611 "atonement" meant reconciliation; now it implies reparation (see Murray). In Old Testament "atonement" is A.V. rendering of a word which implies propitiation (*kipper*), rendered in LXX by (ἐξ) ιλάσκομαι, never by compound of ἀλλάσσω.

the work by which man is made at one with God. Of this Atonement, as embodied and fashioned by the Jewish sacrificial system, there are four chief aspects: reconciliation through a Divine life, redemption by a Divine life, communion with a Divine life, and consecration by a Divine life.

In former days, sin, whether material or moral defilement, neither being nicely distinguished, was felt to be a breach of covenant relationship in which the Jew stood to his GOD. This broken bond was believed to be renewed by the sacrifice of a life—animal, never human among the Jews—and this was called the atonement, or reconciliation. And as the blood was regarded as the principle of life and the seat of vitality, the blood itself came to be regarded as sacred and inviolable, and was prohibited for use as food, while the word "blood" began to be employed as synonymous with life. "For the life [or soul] of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls, and it is the blood that maketh atonement for the soul."[1] The expression "to reconcile" is used as equivalent to "to make an atonement" in the sixth chapter[2]—"And no sin-offering whereof any of the blood is brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to reconcile" (or to make atonement). Reconciliation through a life laid down was therefore one idea embodied in the sacrifices of the Jews.[3]

We have already observed that this reconciliation has a twofold aspect, as St. Paul taught the Corinthians. There is the reconciliation by which GOD reconciles us to Him-

[1] Lev. xvii. 11. [2] Verse 30.

[3] "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to GOD by the death of His SON, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life" (Rom. v. 10). *Cf.* Talmud, "All who die are reconciled through death"; and Jewish prayer, "Let my death be an atonement for all my sins" (Oesterley, "Mediation," p. 110).

self, so pithily described by that Apostle in 2 Cor. v. 19, "GOD was in CHRIST, reconciling the world unto Himself"; while the injunction that follows, "Be ye reconciled to GOD,"[1] shows us another side of the question—our reconciliation with the broken laws of GOD, which is effected by the working of the SPIRIT of CHRIST in our hearts, enabling us "to put off the old man,"[2] which is at enmity with GOD. CHRIST is therefore in both senses, objectively and subjectively, our *way of approach* to GOD,[3] and our reconciliation. In Him we have one Who is the representative of man to GOD and the representative of GOD to man. Drawn away from GOD by that sin which separates between us and Him,[4] we are drawn back to Him by the Cross and passion of Him Who wrought the Atonement, and Whose work of reconciliation still continues; "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to GOD by the death of His SON, much more, having been reconciled, we shall be saved by His life."[5]

Another aspect of the Atonement that was emphasised in the Jewish ritual of sacrifice was redemption by a life. To the Jews, who were familiar with the redemption of the firstborn—which in itself was a recognition that the life of man was owed to GOD, a debt that received universal recognition in the dedication of the life of the Son of Man—with the deliverance from the house of bondage, the words of our LORD were addressed: "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a *ransom for many*."[6] This, as we have already shown, cannot mean as compensation to the Evil One for the captives released from his hold, as some early Christian teachers held, nor as a satisfaction offered to the FATHER'S justice and provided by the FATHER'S mercy, as

[1] 2 Cor. v. 20.
[2] ἀποθέσθαι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον (Eph. iv. 22).
[3] Rom. v. 2.
[4] Isa. lix. 2.
[5] Rom. v. 10.
[6] Mark x. 45.

Anselm taught, nor as payment made to the ideal law of righteousness—for a ransom cannot be paid to an idea.[1] What then? By dying unto sin, by dying rather than sin, CHRIST fulfilled the law of holiness and wrought the deliverance of man from the thraldom of sin. His death was not a price in the literal sense of the term; His death was an instrument, as it were, that effected our freedom from sin, that restored our freedom of will impaired by the ravages of sin; the gift of a new life that redeemed us from the past; that gift which is described by St. John[2] as a "cleansing from all unrighteousness"; by the writer to the Hebrews as "a purging of the conscience from dead works,"[3] and by the master Himself as a regeneration of the tainted nature by water and SPIRIT.[4] Thus the vassals of sin, the slaves of unrighteousness, are emancipated from the bondage, disenthralled from the spell, and healed of the disease of sin by their Redeemer, Whose work still continues, for we learn from St. Paul that "the redemption of our body" is the common desire of both man and creation.[5]

Students of comparative religion inform us that sacrifice in the earliest times had quite another significance, and this the very highest—namely, communion, participation in a common life or in the same food, which was kin both to the GOD and his worshipper—and this sacramental meal became a bond between GOD and man, and man and man.[6] This idea of communion certainly seems to

[1] Dale, "Atonement," p. 357. [2] 1 John i. 9.
[3] Heb. ix. 14. [4] John iii. 6. [5] Rom. viii. 20-23.
[6] The victim was in some way identified with the deity to whom it was offered, and it was held that the worshipper could be brought into mystical union and participation in the nature of his god. This idea may have originated in connection with the gods of corn and wine. Corn and wine give sustenance to human beings, and the instinct of worship accordingly led those sustained to offer sacrifice to them, sometimes of animals that destroyed the corn, such as the boar or goat; often, however, of animals that lived on the corn, and were

underlie the peace-offerings of the Jews, only a portion of these sacrifices being consumed upon the altar, the remainder being eaten by the offerer and those who were associated with him in the spirit of the sacrifice. And in the New Testament we learn that our Master desired us to communicate—that is, to have a share in His life, symbolised by His blood. "Drink ye all of it," He said, as He held the cup to them, "for this is My blood, the blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."[1] Thus we have in the sacrifice of CHRIST a sacrament of life in which we all may participate, a communion in a Divine life given to man, forming a bond, a living connection between the CHRIST and His followers, so that He is the Vine and we are the branches, He is the Body and we are the members. Our LORD'S work for us cannot be separated from His work in us. We are identified with Him as the offerer was with His sacrifice. He takes away our sins by making us enter into His sufferings. As we yield ourselves to Him, He gives His life to us, and in that life we have the benefit of forgiveness that means reunion, the pardon that spells peace. But we also learn with Him to enter into the anguish and pain of redemption. We learn to suffer and to pray. And so in our own case, without shedding of blood—bitter tears—there is no remission. Communion in a Divine life is thus another and a very important element of the Atonement.

There remains yet another aspect of the Atonement to be considered, and this the highest—the consecration of man in the consecration of the SAVIOUR, which connects the work of the High-Priest with the work of the Lamb of GOD. The offering of slain beasts was appointed to

---

thought to be the embodiment of the corn-spirit. See, further, Tisdall, "Comparative Religion," p. 74.

[1] Matt. xxvi. 28.

teach an ignorant people by an unmistakable object-lesson that all life belongs to GOD and must be consecrated. Consecration was one supreme idea of the Jewish sacrifices expressed in the burnt-offering, all of which was consumed on the altar, in token that the offerer presented himself, as the Apostle Paul exhorts us to do,[1] a living sacrifice unto God. Now CHRIST as the High-Priest[2] of our race offered Himself—the offering of a life without spot or blemish—wholly devoted to His FATHER'S work, "a sacrifice for a sweet-smelling savour."[3] As we read the Epistle to the Hebrews with this thought of the consecration of the CHRIST before our mind, a new light will be shed upon its dark page. As our High-Priest He consecrated Himself, that from His consecration of the humanity which He carried in common with us our manhood too might receive consecration. It would seem that our very sins have been changed by His sacrifice, as St. Peter wrote,[4] using a sacrificial word *ἀνήνεγκεν* that occurs also (in the infinitive mood) in Heb. ix. 28, "Who Himself bare our sins in His body on the tree"—literally, transformed our sins by His obedience into an oblation to GOD. This consecrating influence that flows back upon us from His Cross is the grace that sweetens the bitterness and the power that strengthens us for the battle of life; it is the love that keeps cleansing us from all sin. It was in this way that the Lamb takes away the sin of the world.

We have learnt that the secret of this work lay in the perfect identification of the SAVIOUR with the sinner He came to save. We have seen that His removal of sin did not lie in "His enduring the penalty instead of inflicting it,"[5] because He could not really suffer the natural and

[1] Rom. xii. 1.
[2] See preceding chapter, "Priesthood and Sacrifice."
[3] Eph. v. 2.
[4] 1 Pet. ii. 24.
[5] Dr. Dale, "The Atonement," Preface, lxvi.

logical consequences of sin, the pangs of conscience, the loss of self-respect, and the ruin of the will. Yet by reason of His organic unity with us, He was pledged to the whole lot of our humanity, to bear our sins and our sufferings; He was so completely identified with our nature that He felt the throbbings of the great heart of humanity and its yearnings for redemption from sin, and He was so penetrated by the sense of the world's sin—which, however, was not consciousness of sin—which entered His soul by every channel, that He endured in a manner and degree we can never fathom the dreadful separation and isolation that sin works in the life of man, so that He, although GOD and Man in One Person, cried out on the Cross: "My GOD, My GOD, why hast Thou forsaken Me?"

He did more in reality, then, than merely endure the punishment of sin—a thing impossible if punishment has any ethical and personal meaning—and relieve us of its presence. For by His obedience as the Representative of humanity He has transformed our nature into a sacrifice to GOD; by His suffering He has changed the nature of suffering into a Divine discipline; by His death He has redeemed our self-respect, released our wills, removed the curse of alienation, put away the shame of death, the sentence of sin, and converted it into an act of obedience to GOD; and by His rising He has made death an entrance into a higher life.

But it was not His sacrifice or His suffering or His death—nothing He did and endured—but what He was and is that is our redemption.[1] It is His personal relation to mankind, in its sin, in its want of holiness, that gives point and power to the figures of Old Testament history. Faith is belief in a person, not an article. Love is attracted to a person, not a principle. Hope is realised

[1] "Who of GOD is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption" (1 Cor. i. 30).

in a union of persons. Such faith, hope, and love are mysteries, but not greater than the personality that is swayed or influenced by them. They are not contrary to the reason of man; they simply transcend it. The spirit has arguments that the mind knows nothing of. The core of the personality is not brain but spirit, not intellect but love. It is the personal experience of a Lamb that has suffered, and taken away our sin: of a High-Priest Whose intercession and pardon, love and benediction have soothed —and not the abstractions of idealism—that is the truest evidence of the truth of the loving, sorrowing Personality Who has atoned, because they have won our love, and with it our adherence. Articles, principles, creeds, laws, regulate, discipline, restrain, confine, but Personality inspires love, service, and devotion unto death. Personality sffuers and atones, pardons and protects. The personality of the Servant of Jahveh is the predominant feature of the second portion of Isaiah; the Personality of the Son of Man, Who is the Redeemer of mankind, is the central power and influence of the Gospels and Epistles.

He is still the Lamb "as it had been slain" before the throne. The marks of His sufferings are a continual remembrance of what He endured. He requires that His body, His Church, which represents Him in the world, should fill up the remainder of His sufferings, that so it may be the "fulness of Him Who is being fulfilled all in all."[1] He still suffers with His people, and as they suffer with and for Him He represents them before GOD; He inspires them with His living presence, His Divine Spirit, and so His Church becomes the witness of the presence of an eternal, indestructive Personality. "GOD is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved."[2]

We now understand something of the import of those

[1] Eph. i. 23, R.V. [2] Ps. xlvi. 5

memorable words: "Behold the Lamb of GOD, which taketh away the sin of the world."

Of all the aspects in which our CHRIST is pictured in the New Testament this is the most tender and winning. For He Who with lamblike patience and sacrifice resigned His life for the sake of those He loved unto death, draws after Him with an irresistible influence a multitude, sin-stricken and sorrowing, but no longer despairing or dejected. Under the shadow of His Cross, the shame of our iniquity looms large, the need of an Atonement is intensified. We hate our sin, ourself, our habits, everything that separates us from the life of CHRIST and the love of GOD. Under its shadow we learn the martyrdom of love and the mission of sorrow—

> "And the strength to suffer is endowered
> With a life no tyranny can still."

Under its shadow we find pardon and peace. Under its shadow we see the meaning of that coming scene in the kingdom of the Lamb, described with all the glowing eloquence of St. John[1]: "After these things I saw, and behold, a great multitude, which no man could number, out of every nation, and tribes, and peoples, and languages, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, robed in white raiment, with palms in their hands, and crying with a great voice, saying, Salvation belongs to Him Who sitteth on the throne of our GOD, and to the Lamb."

This is the Lamb Who taketh away the sin of the world. In a general sense the SAVIOUR of all men, in a special sense He is the SAVIOUR of those who walk in the shadow of His Cross.

[1] Rev. vii. 9, 10.

CHAPTER XII

ATONEMENT AND RESPONSIBILITY

"A SHARPLY marked and continued consciousness of guilt, without which the whole Christian idea of reconciliation is unintelligible, becomes methodically possible only when we judge ourselves after the idea of transcendental freedom,"[1] is Ritschl's remark in reference to the Kantian system.

The philosopher's belief in human freedom is not affected by the Christian doctrine of Atonement. Human responsibility is perfectly consistent with the work wrought in us, and for us, by CHRIST. In the first place we are persons, not puppets, men, not machines, and therefore we have responsibilities, duties, and privileges which we must not shirk, and in the fulfilment and realisation of which our personalities are developed. CHRIST has not interfered with the liberty of the subject. He has transformed the freedom of the will into the spontaneous development of the soul, freely evolving on the lines of His life. It is the abuse of past privileges that limits present privileges, the neglect of bygone responsibilities that leads to the neglect of present responsibilities, the misuse of past freedom that restricts present freedom. Both in a negative and positive manner He has increased the sphere of our freedom by removing hindrances to our self-realisation in the external world and in our own selves, and by increasing

[1] "Justification and Reconciliation," i. 394.

our powers and capacities by His Divine Spirit, the Spirit of the Crucified, Who helps us to realise our highest selfhood in the kingdom of GOD. That He has increased our freedom is clear from this, that He has quickened our consciousness of guilt, which depends on, and develops with, our sense of moral freedom.

Our thesis, accordingly, is (1) that CHRIST has added to our responsibilities the racial responsibility, and removed none; (2) that He has increased our sphere of duty, developed our conception of duty, and made our obligation more binding by increasing our privilege; (3) that He has hallowed life, its relations and duties, by redeeming it by His life and sanctifying it wholly by taking hold on every part of human life; and (4) that He gave us a new motive to perform our duties —love.

In the first place, consider a man under the Christian régime in all his diverse capacities: Privately, as son, husband, and father; publicly, as citizen, soldier, statesman, teacher, and minister of holy things. These and many other relations involve new and different duties which a Christian man is bound to fulfil honourably, to himself, to his family, to his wife, to his state, and his Church. How few of these relations and their duties were recognised as binding before CHRIST! Brace's "Gesta Christi" proves incontestably that the rights of men, and women, and children were placed on a new basis by the spirit and example and Church of CHRIST. *Slaves* have owed emancipation, *women* protection, *children* safety, and *men* the laws and usages of chivalry, honour, and *noblesse oblige* to the example and inspiration of JESUS, Who taught men to be pure, good, and self-sacrificing, tender and merciful to their weaker brethren, and to live in charity with all men.

Again, with respect to our duty to GOD we ask, When

did men fully acknowledge before the Incarnation the relation in which they stood to, and the duty they owed to, their Heavenly FATHER? By the act of the SON of GOD humanity was brought into a new relation with GOD, and from that relation a thousand new duties sprang. And these duties did not cause any of the old to be superseded. "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to GOD the things that are GOD's"; while at the same time our obligations to GOD, the Fount of our being, the Source of our spiritual life, are emphasised and intensified in a manner undreamt of under the old pagan régime of life, but in accordance with Rom. xii. 1: "I beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of GOD, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto GOD, which is your reasonable service." Never in the whole world's history was such a sacrifice offered in the grand and exalted spirit of the Apostle's words before CHRIST made that great Sacrifice, which was to be both inspiration and example for His people. Other and great renunciations—such as that of Buddha—have been made, but where was one so potent in its after-effects, so universal in its range, so inspiring to men, so true to the human personality in its integrity, so acceptable to GOD?

In CHRIST humanity is not only a new creature, but a living organism, one great body united by a vast network of relations and responsibilities, as the human body is connected by nerves, ligaments, and fibres. In CHRIST this vast network of relations and responsibilities is a bond that links all humanity together. The circle of our duties is ever widening, for its centre is the CHRIST in our hearts, its radius the sympathy of CHRIST, and its circumference the world. We can readily understand that the longer the radius is the wider is the circle. In the same manner the larger our range of sympathetic

intercourse the greater is the sphere of love and the wider the field of duty.

The precept of CHRIST, "Love one another," has increased, not diminished, the sphere of duty, for it has extended it in the Parable of the Good Samaritan so far as to embrace all men, and it has filled in the simple sketch and bare outline of the Christian programme given in the Sermon of the Kingdom with a tissue of duties and obligations that make us realise in some measure the importance of man's spiritual, moral, and physical life in the sight of GOD.

CHRIST did not come to remove any of these responsibilities—nay, he increased our responsibilities to live a righteous and unselfish life by His life and death of self-sacrifice. In His doctrine He exhorted all men to make use of the talents GOD had given them, to the glory of GOD and the relief of their fellow-men. He made us responsible for one another, and caused us to feel that we are our brother's keeper. He showed us by His world-wide compassion and death for every man that all mankind is lovable, and that the life lived for others is the best and noblest life to live—a life full of anxiety and responsibility, but replete with thankfulness and hope. The SON of GOD, Who became the Son of Man to make the sons of men sons of GOD, *felt that He was responsible to GOD for their sin*, and that He was responsible to man for their sorrow, and He communicates to the members of His Body His own life, with all its prerogatives and privileges, and with all its responsibility. And that responsibility, central and solidary, because of the unity of the race, He has extended to us, who are members of His Body. In the first place, as He was responsible to His FATHER to follow out the laws of His life, all humanity, as redeemed by Him, shares in that responsibility, which is a responsibility of righteousness; and, in

the second place, as He was responsible to GOD for His brethren, He has made us who have entered into His responsibilities responsible for one another by a responsibility of brotherhood. The CHRIST in us is responsible not only for the sorrow, but also for the conduct, of the race. The responsibility of CHRIST is thus re-enacted on a larger field.

And this responsibility He emphasised in His doctrine and by His death. Look at the marvellous powers of man, who is in his highest form little "less than archangel ruined." "In action how like an angel, in apprehension how like a god," with his sublime reason and his Divine capabilities, with his spirit that has come from the FATHER of Spirits and aspires to return to GOD, Who is its home; with his soaring intellect that can measure the orbits and calculate the influences of the stars; with his mighty will that can master the elements of wind, and wave, and electricity, and press the very air into his service; and with that grand principle of faith in his heart that has enabled him to brave every peril and endure every hardship for the Truth. Such a being, such a complex personality is not an empty vessel, but a free, responsible agent, "armed and well prepared" for GOD'S work and his brother's necessity; accountable for all his actions and the determiner of his own character, which he fashions, generally speaking, with his own hands. This fact is emphasised in the Master's parable of the Pounds, in which the different servants are represented as having complete power and discretion in the use of their trust. But the same parable impresses the fact upon us that life and all its powers and gifts are a trust, and that we are accountable, and doubly accountable as Christians, for the use we make of that trust. This principle is everywhere conspicuously displayed in the Master's life, and prominently presented in His teaching.

We shall now see that this responsibility is not removed by the death of CHRIST for us; nay, rather that it is increased. We suffer for our sins, and are therefore responsible for our deeds. This is a plain fact, undeniable and pitiless. Till the end of time man must feel remorse for shirking the responsibilities his conscience tells him are his. Evil deeds leave traces sometimes ineffaceable on character, memory, position, and constitution. The Atoning sacrifice of JESUS may be a sufficient oblation for the sins of the world in GOD'S sight; but it is not intended to be a substitute for our sufferings. For the fact remains that each man suffers for himself, and reaps where he has sown. Individual suffering is the greater part of our human experience. But that Atonement has converted what would otherwise appear a stern and just punishment into a healthy and merciful discipline for the soul. The Atonement of JESUS throws light upon suffering, but does not remove it. It takes away, however, its utterly oppressive side. We still suffer death. But death has been redeemed. It is now an entrance to a fuller life of union with CHRIST and communion with His Saints. The path of sorrow is still trodden, but under new and transformed conditions. So the *via dolorosa* becomes the *porta triumphalis*. Sorrow, too, is not only redeemed from its earthly taint, it is sanctified by the sorrows of the Holy One of GOD. "Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem Him stricken, smitten of GOD and afflicted." Sorrow is, accordingly, the universal heritage as suffering is the general lot of mankind. And both always follow in the track of sin for all the Atonement of our Blessed LORD. This is an understood thing, and it is assumed by the experienced as the basal principle of ethical life. Accordingly no man can honestly say, "I never sinned, I never trangressed the laws of Nature, of GOD and man,

and I do not deserve to suffer." For as there is no exception to the experience that every man is a sinner, there is no exemption from the law that individual suffering is part of man's experience. Neither can man honestly say, "I have lived like a prodigal, but I do not merit poverty, because CHRIST died for my sins"; or, "I have done wickedly and ruined my constitution, but I do not deserve such a result because CHRIST suffered in my stead, the innocent for the guilty"; or, "I have wilfully and deliberately pursued a course of deceitfulness and have lost the respect of my neighbours, but such a punishment is unjust, because CHRIST bore my sins in His body on the tree"; or, "I have allowed myself to form pernicious habits, following my lowest tendencies, having given way to them by degrees, one little act of sin succeeding another, until the force of evil got so strong in me that it is now my master, and I am powerless against it; but I do not comprehend how such is the case if another bore the punishment of my sins"; or, "I have never attended to my religious duties, have forsaken the Blessed Communion, have ceased to pray to my Heavenly FATHER, and now my heart is hard and I cannot pray even when I wish to do so. I cannot understand such a result if CHRIST died for my sins." No honest man could make such excuses. For the vicarious suffering of CHRIST on the Cross for the sin of the world has never released man of the responsibility of living a good life, nor delivered man from the just results of his deeds.[1]

As we look at the sacrifice of CHRIST from the Divine standpoint, it was an assertion of the justice of GOD'S law; as we look at it from the human standpoint, it was

[1] "Against this doctrine of forgiveness in its unrestrained freeness and its vicarious reference, it might be urged that if forgiveness is to be given after this fashion to every man that asks it from a broken heart, the end will not be righteousness, but unrighteousness" ("Doctrine of Grace," *Expositor*, liii. 331).

an offering to GOD, which the best men have wished to make, but only one was perfect enough to present—the sacrifice of a sinless life. Such a sacrifice could not relieve us of our duties. Nay, rather it has increased our responsibilities by increasing GOD's and man's claims upon us. Neither could such a sacrifice deliver us from sufferings of body and mind and spirit—the natural results and the temporal penalties of our wrongdoing. For we still suffer sorrow, remorse, and death. This would not be so if CHRIST had been a substitute for our punishment.

Our responsibility has been further increased by CHRIST, from Whom we learn not only to bear our own load, but to help to bear the heavy burdens of others. For the intercession of the SAVIOUR on our behalf was the most perfect exhibition of that principle of mediation which prevails all over the world, both in the human and in the subhuman species,[1] and which causes man to suffer, more or less, because of and instead of his fellow man. That responsibility to suffer for and sympathise with others has been intensified by the work and example of JESUS, and was well expressed in the words of St. Paul, "Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of CHRIST for His Body's sake, which is the Church" (Col. i. 24).

Thus human responsibility has been increased by identification with Divine responsibility; GOD's claims upon us are greater because of forgiveness and new life. Because of the vaster privileges of the Christian Church,

[1] Spencer ("Justice," p. 15), speaking of gregarious animals, says: "Later in origin and narrower in range is the third law that under such conditions—such that, by the occasional sacrifices of some members of a species, the species as a whole prospers—there arises a sanction for such sacrifices, and a consequent qualification of the law that each individual shall receive the benefits and evils of its own nature."

there is a new obligation to present our bodies a living sacrifice. And the Atoning Sacrifice of CHRIST has quickened the feeling that man should suffer something, not only for his own sins, but also for the sins of others. In virtue of our common humanity, we must encounter a common evil—sin, which was met and vanquished by the representative Man, and having been defeated by Him, is easier for us to overcome. The sacrifice of the life and death of CHRIST has been wrought *for* us; but it must be wrought *in* us by the SPIRIT—that is to say, it must become part of our nature if we are to derive life from His sacrifice—that is, if it is to be efficacious. This becomes a call to present our bodies a living sacrifice; a new motive to live in communion with CHRIST; a new incentive to bear our brothers' burdens and to endure, not only the results of our own follies with meekness and resignation, but also the consequences of the wrongdoings of others with sympathy and love.

It is thus that the Mediation of our LORD is not an escape from punishment, but the consecration of an old life and the inspiration of a new life, redeeming because it re-creates, ennobling because it exalts.

WELLS GARDNER, DARTON & CO., LTD., 3 & 4, PATERNOSTER BUILDINGS, E.C.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

"An excellent account of the surroundings, the writings, the teaching and the life of a truly lovable man. Among many well-arranged topics are the account of Alexandria, Clement's teaching on the Incarnation, the Bible, and the Sacraments, with a carefully-executed reconstruction of Clement's creed."—*Guardian.*

"Is evidently a clever man and a good scholar."—*Athenæum.*

"A succinct account of Alexandria and the spiritual antecedents of Clement . . . followed by an interesting account of Clement's own work."—*Spectator.*

"An original and very searching study."—*Church of Ireland Gazette.*

"A model handbook for English students of the Fathers . . . brightly written, well set out, and full of matter."—*London Quarterly Review.*

"As a compendious account of the man and his works and the times which produced him, the book is worthy of all praise."—*Church Times.*

THE PRESENT CONTROVERSY ON PRAYER.

"The book will clear away many doubts and furnish much encouragement to humble and believing minds. It is a sensible and reasonable survey of the whole question."—*London Quarterly Review.*

"An attempt to answer the philosophical, scientific, and experimental objections to prayer. Sound argument and reverent conviction go hand in hand, and we feel the writer makes his points."—*Churchman.*

"Will be welcomed by Christians in general, irrespective of creed."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

"Exposes the Christian value of prayer; . . . not only deserves, but ought to receive universal study and consideration."—*Academy.*

"The division of the subject-matter is clear, and the work is rich in illustrations."—*Tablet.*

"Deals very effectively with the objections urged against prayer."—*English Churchman.*

"A valuable addition to our literature in defence of religion against Atheism and Agnosticism."—*Catholic Book Notes.*

"Has already made his reputation as a careful and philosophic writer."—*Church of Ireland Gazette.*

"A somewhat original feature is the collection of extracts from the prayers of heathendom and Judaism, . . . but the most valuable chapters are perhaps those which are devoted to different aspects of the *Pater Noster.*"—*Guardian.*

ST. AUGUSTINE'S "CITY OF GOD."

A Translation, with Notes. New and Revised Edition.

"Indicates the greatest care in the way of an exact translation."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

"Most efficiently edited . . . introduction excellent; of great interest and value to students."—*London Quarterly Review.*

"A capital edition of an early Church classic with a valuable preface."—*Methodist Sunday School Record.*

"Is skilfully analyzed, abridged, and annotated."—*Gentleman's Journal.*

SUGGESTIONS FOR BIBLE STUDY.

"Especially suitable for that large section of thinking people who desire to know more fully the true basis of our belief in the sufficiency of Scripture. . . . Mr. Hitchcock, in addition to extensive reading, has in marked degree a power of thought and expression."—*Church Gazette.*

"Mr. Hitchcock goes beyond the language to the thought of the Bible, but the value of his book lies in the fact that he goes through the language."—*Expository Times.*

"We cannot too warmly commend the volume of 'Suggestions for Bible Study' just issued by the Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, the author of several standard works which are widely read and valued."—*News.*

"Much learning and more thoughtfulness have gone to the making of this opportune and helpful book. . . . We are very glad to have read the book, and to commend it to our readers."—*Guardian.*

"Deals sanely and sympathetically with the questions of authority and interpretation, revelation and its problems."—*Life of Faith.*

"This work is one the clergy will be glad to know of as a book they can suitably recommend to intelligent laymen."—*Dublin Express.*

"Will have great value to those whose minds have been disturbed by recent critical inquiries, and will tend to the settlement of thought."—*London Quarterly Review.*

CHRIST AND HIS CRITICS.

"Mr. Hitchcock writes with a clearness not always associated with a theologian, a simplicity of diction and expression of thought that makes his volume as attractive as it is valuable."—*Irish Times.*

"A well-written and well-informed book. . . . Examines the revelations of science with fine judgment and grasp of detail. . . . This is a strong book, and it will do much good."—*Life of Faith.*

"Method critical, equipment adequate, conclusions conservative."—*Christian World.*

"Is one of the most erudite writers on theological subjects we have on this side of the Irish Sea."—*Dublin Express.*

"The book is not merely criticism of the critics—it is commendation of the Christ."—*Expository Times.*

"These 'Studies in the Person and Problems of Jesus' are thoughtful, able, and reverent."—*Sword and Trowel.*

"Brings out a really telling argument for the Divinity and authority of Christ with force."—*British Congregationalist.*

"The fruit of careful reading, and is written with zeal and deep reverence."—*Churchman.*

"Sane and adequate treatment of the *kenosis* theories, and in an appendix there is a short and careful analysis of the views set out by Dr. Sanday in his recent book. . . . The book is marked throughout by accurate scholarship, with which is combined a true spiritual instinct."—*Church Gazette.*

"Valuable discussion of modern problems."—*Record.*

THE MYSTERY OF THE CROSS.

"A carefully-written narrative of the events of Holy Week. . . . Of considerable expository service."—*Guardian.*

"Scholarly and devotional, practical and critical, . . . stimulating and suggestive, . . . a valuable help to the clergy in their work of preparation."—*Irish Times.*

"A scholarly and devout examination of all the events of the Great Week. . . . We feel the writer is an honour to the Church of Ireland. The book is full of information and of sound teaching conveyed in a beautiful spirit."—*Church in the West.*

"Deeply reverent, both orthodox and critical. . . . Alike for personal study and help in teaching, this volume will be found a very valuable aid."—*Church Family Newspaper.*

"Much freshness of treatment, with evidence of careful study. . . . A volume which all can read and benefit by."—*National Church.*

"A solid contribution to the cause of sacred literature."—*Church of Ireland Gazette.*

TYPES OF CELTIC LIFE AND ART.

"A charming book . . . An ample introduction affords a comprehensive view of the history of the country in the remotest past. . . . Chapters marked not only by learning, but by independent research. . . . So fresh in its delineations of type and character as to hold attention fixed throughout all its pages."—*Irish Times.*

"A careful and conscientious book. . . . The author has written in an attractive and forcible style with a pleasant savour of urbanity. . . . As a collection of popular essays it sustains a high level."—*Sinn Fein.*

"An instructive book."—*Times.*

MIDLAND SEPTS AND THE PALE.

"Mr. Hitchcock is never happier than when describing Irish scenery."—*Irish Independent.*

"We can fully commend it to all students of Irish history."—*Belfast Newsletter.*

"A book of a popular kind which readers interested in the past of Ireland will be glad to have."—*Times.*

"Lovers of things Celtic will thank Mr. Hitchcock for his capable volume."—*Dundee Advertiser.*

"Mr. Hitchcock has added a book to the Irish library as well conceived as it is pleasantly written."—*Dublin Express.*

"Gives a very interesting chapter on the plantation of the whole district. . . . The book is entirely free from any controversial bias."—*Weekly Irish Times.*

"We cannot praise too highly his attitude of critical detachment, his wide tolerance, and the fairness with which he states the point of view of each of the warring factions."—*Northern Whig.*

"Vivid account of the doings of the original Irish septs and the later English settlers of the King's County."—*Scotsman.*

239.092
1910-'11

Hitchcock, Rev. F. R. M. 1910-'11

The atonement & modern

239.092
1910-'11